



THE
CHRISTIAN UNITARIAN

A MONTHLY MAGAZINE.

"This is life eternal, that they might know Thee the only true God, and
Jesus Christ whom Thou hast sent."—JOHN xvii. 3.

VOLUME II.

FEBRUARY, 1863—JANUARY, 1864.

BELFAST:
UNITARIAN DEPOSITORY, 45, ARTHUR STREET.
LONDON: E. T. WHITFIELD, 178, STRAND.
1864.

BELFAST:
PRINTED BY ALEX. MAYNE,
HIGH STREET.

X288.4

Cu 891

vi 2

CONTENTS.

FEBRUARY.

	PAGE
A Word of Introduction, ...	1
Colenso on the Pentateuch, ...	3
Congregational Memoirs—Ballycarry, or Broadisland, ...	14
What the Scriptures Teach—No. 1, ...	21
Gleanings from the "Bible Christian,"	22
Licensing of Candidates in the Remonstrant Synod before the adoption of the New Code, ...	29
The late Rev. F. Blakely and Dr. Montgomery, ...	30
POETRY—Faith in Divine Goodness, ...	20
INTELLIGENCE, ...	34—36

MARCH.

Colenso on the Pentateuch—(Concluded), ...	37
Congregational Memoirs—Ballycarry, or Broadisland—(Continued), ...	49
What the Scriptures Teach—No. 2, ...	55
A Free Church—What Does it Mean?	57
Dr. Montgomery and the late Rev. F. Blakely, ...	60
POETRY—An Angel sits beside the Tomb, ...	57
INTELLIGENCE, ...	69—72

APRIL.

What if the Miracles be not true?	73
Congregational Memoirs—Ballycarry, or Broadisland—(Continued), ...	78
Thoughts on the Resurrection, ...	86
What the Scriptures Teach—No. 3, ...	88
Rev. R. Cleland's Statement of Religious Belief, ...	89
Dr. Montgomery and the late Rev. F. Blakely, ...	91
Bishop Colenso and his Episcopal Brethren, ...	101
Prosecution of Professor Jowett for Heresy, ...	102
Rev. J. S. Porter and his Critics, ...	103
POETRY—The Future Life, ...	77
INTELLIGENCE, ...	104—107

MAY.

Colenso on the Pentateuch, ...	109
Congregational Memoirs—Ballycarry, or Broadisland (Continued), ...	121
The Lord's Supper: Its Nature and Object, ...	130
What the Scriptures Teach—No. 4, ...	134
An Elder Vindicated, ...	135
REVIEW—The New Theology, ...	137
Dr. Montgomery and the late Rev. F. Blakely, ...	140
POETRY—Lines on a Skeleton, ...	119
INTELLIGENCE, ...	142—144

JUNE.

Free Inquiry, ...	145
Congregational Memoirs—Ballycarry, or Broadisland (Continued), ...	153
What the Scriptures Teach—No. 5, ...	163
The late Mr. Scott of Girvan, ...	164
Carrickfergus Congregation, ...	168
Dr. Montgomery and the late Rev. F. Blakely, ...	171
POETRY—Wait, ...	162
INTELLIGENCE, ...	172—180

JULY.

	PAGE
Discipleship and Creeds, ...	181
Congregational Memoirs—Ballycarry, or Broadisland (<i>Continued</i>), ..	188
The Ballyclare Case, ...	195
A Mission to Mothers, ...	201
Our Annual Meetings, ...	206
What our Neighbours think of Us, ...	207
The Rev. John Hall and his Congregation, ...	208
POETRY—Not Yet, ...	188
INTELLIGENCE, ...	210—216

AUGUST.

The Scriptures our Rule of Faith and Duty, ...	217
Congregational Memoirs—Ballycarry, or Broadisland (<i>Concluded</i>), ..	221
The Origin and Aim of Sunday Schools, ...	230
"My Father's House,"	234
REVIEW—Unitarianism in the Present Time, ...	238
Belfast Domestic Mission, ...	241
The Elder and the Presbytery of Antrim, ...	243
The Late Meetings, ...	245
POETRY—All's Well, ...	228
INTELLIGENCE, ...	247—252

SEPTEMBER.

What is Christianity? By Dr. Gannett, ...	253
Who are to be our Ministers?	260
Mr. Bowring on the Origin and Aim of Sunday Schools, ...	264
Mr. Bruce in reply to the Rev. S. C. Nelson, ...	267
Congregational Memoirs—Larne and Kilwaughter, ...	270
Review of Bache on Miracles, ...	281
The Presbytery of Antrim and its Elder, ...	284
INTELLIGENCE, ...	286—288

OCTOBER.

Non-Subscriber: its Original Meaning, ...	289
Congregational Memoirs—Larne and Kilwaughter (<i>Continued</i>), ..	296
Which is the Intolerant Party among the Non-Subscribing Presbyterians? ..	306
REVIEW—First Lessons on Natural Theology, ...	316
An Alleged Calumny, ...	316
INTELLIGENCE, ...	322—324

NOVEMBER.

The Church of the Free, ...	325
Congregational Memoirs—Larne and Kilwaughter (<i>Continued</i>), ..	329
What is Christianity? (<i>Continued</i>), ...	338
What the Scriptures Teach—No. 6, ...	343
Winter and the Poor, ...	344
A First Step towards a Chancery Suit, ...	348
Minutes of the Remonstrant Synod of Ulster, 1863, ...	351
Mr. R. M'Calmont and "The Alleged Calumny,"	357
POETRY—At a Grave, ...	337
INTELLIGENCE, ...	358, 360

DECEMBER.

The Judgment in the Ballyclare Case, ...	361
The Christian Miracles, ...	372
Recent Meeting of the Remonstrant Synod, ...	373
An Attempted Explanation and Defence, ...	378
Letter to the Rev. Dr. Beard, Manchester, ...	384
POETRY—The First Christmas Morn, ...	371
INTELLIGENCE, ...	387—396

JANUARY.

Notes on the Ballyclare Case, ...	397
What is Christianity? (<i>Continued</i>), ...	402
Congregational Memoirs—Larne and Kilwaughter (<i>Continued</i>), ..	407
"Emmanuel, God with Us,"	416
Grounds for Apprehensions, ...	420
Joseph Barker returned to Christianity, ...	423
REVIEW—The Sunday School Penny Magazine, ...	425
INTELLIGENCE, ...	426—428

781

THE CHRISTIAN UNITARIAN.

VOL. II.]

FEBRUARY, 1863.

[No. 1.

A WORD OF INTRODUCTION.

At the beginning of a new volume of the *Christian Unitarian*, we desire, in a few sentences, to place distinctly before our readers the principles which we seek to maintain, and the ground we desire to occupy. Agreeing with our fellow-Christians of other denominations in believing that the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament contain a Divine Revelation, we differ from them in the interpretation of these Scriptures; for while the majority of Christians believe that God subsists in Three Persons, we believe that he is essentially *one—one* Being in One Person; and while the prevailing opinion among Christians is, that Jesus Christ is God the Son, we believe that he is, in his highest office, the Son of God. If to these two doctrines we add that of God's unchangeable, unfailing, and universal love, embodied in his character of FATHER, we have the three leading principles of Christian Unitarianism, based as they are on the plainest teachings of Scripture, and confirmed by an intelligent study of nature. These principles it is the great object of our Magazine to expound, illustrate, and defend.

While a patient and reverent study of the sacred volume has led many, from time to time, to dissent from the prevailing doctrines of the more popular Churches, and to embrace the principles of Christian Unitarianism, it has ever been a distinguishing characteristic of the denomination to contend for the perfect right of every man to read and interpret the Scriptures for himself; and hence, while their own views are distinctly and avowedly Unitarian, they claim for all men the utmost liberty in religious matters; nor do they presume to judge and condemn those who believe more, or those who believe less than themselves. But they justly censure those who profess one form of Christian doctrine, while

they hold another, or say that the Gospel is their "rule of faith," while they consider the miracles of Christ to be legends, and his resurrection a myth.

Till recently it was a great distinction of the Unitarian Church, that its ministers were the earnest advocates of the Divine authority of revelation, and made it the foundation of their Church, and their only rule of faith; but it has unfortunately happened, in the course of the last few years, that a spirit of scepticism and unbelief has crept into the body, and the principle has been tacitly admitted or openly maintained, that men may be ordained to the ministry in the Unitarian Church, although they should regard the Scriptures only as a mixture of the historical and legendary, and consider Christ as nothing more than a gifted Jewish peasant. Against views so derogatory to the Saviour, and so subversive of the consolations and hopes of the Gospel, we desire most distinctly to protest, and we shall do the best we can to expose and refute them.

In looking back on the volume which has been completed, we regret to find that so large a portion of it has been occupied with personal discussions and local controversy. These were, however, the unavoidable result of the agitation that has for some time prevailed in the Non-Subscribing Churches. It has hitherto been, and it shall continue to be, our endeavour to omit, as far as possible, everything that may be personally offensive. When there is misstatement or misrepresentation, it is right that it should be corrected; but beyond what is necessary to protect individual character, or vindicate our Christian principles, we desire to write no line that might wound even the most sensitive.

We maintain the Oneness of God, in opposition to those who hold that he is Three in One; we maintain the Sufficiency of Scripture, in opposition to those who hold that the people need a human confession of faith, as a key to unlock its meaning; we maintain the Divine Mission of Christ, in opposition to those who deny his mission and spurn his authority. Here are principles surely important enough to interest the inquiring mind, and the more they can be separated from personal altercations and disputes, the more clearly shall we be able to apprehend their truth and appreciate their value.

COLENSO ON THE PENTATEUCH.*

BISHOP COLENSO has experienced the fate of every man who has endeavoured to weed out errors, or what he looks upon as errors, that have been connected with religion, for the purpose of removing that obstacle to the reception and influence of Christianity which is occasioned by the prevalence of those errors. He has been misunderstood, and misrepresented. He has been treated as if he *made* the facts which he merely discusses; he has been railed at as if his object were to overturn our holy faith; whereas, his purpose is the very reverse. He desires to strengthen faith, by getting rid of a canker worm that is gnawing at its vitals, in many a thoughtful mind. Surely such a man deserves to receive, even from those who may not view the facts as he views them, or who may consider his arguments as void of force, the praise due to a holy and religious intent.

The statement of the circumstances in which his book had its origin might, one would think, have disarmed the severity of criticism.

He says, there was a time in his life when he could have heartily assented to the language of Mr. Burgon, who asserts that “the Bible is none other than *the voice of Him that sitteth upon the Throne!* Every book of it—every chapter of it—every verse of it—every word of it—every syllable of it—every letter of it—is the *direct utterance of the Most High!* The Bible is none other than the Word of God: not some part of it more, some part of it less; but all alike, *the utterance of Him that sitteth upon the Throne; absolute, faultless, unerring, supreme!*” But this was before his attention had been drawn to the “facts which make such a view impossible for most reflecting and inquiring minds.”—(P. 6.) He continues:—

“God is my witness, what hours of wretchedness I have spent at times, while reading the Bible devoutly from day to day, and reverencing every word of it as the Word of God, when petty contradictions met me, which seemed to my reason to conflict with the

* *The Pentateuch and Book of Joshua, critically examined.* By the Right Rev. JOHN WILLIAM COLENSO, *Bishop of Natal.* London, 1862. 8vo.

notion of the absolute historical veracity of every part of Scripture ; and which, as I felt, *in the study of any other book*, we should honestly treat as errors or mis-statements, without in the least detracting from the real value of the book ! But in those days I was taught that it was my duty to fling the suggestion from me at once, ‘as if it were a loaded shell shot into the fortress of my soul,’ or to stamp out desperately, as with an iron heel, each spark of honest doubt which God’s own gift, the love of truth, had kindled in my bosom. And by many a painful effort I succeeded in doing so for a season ; though, while thus dealing with my own doubts, I never certainly presumed to think—with one (Mr. Burgon) who ‘thanks God that the cold shade of unbelief has never for an instant darkened his own spirit’—that each ‘solitary doubter was paying the bitter penalty, doubtless, of his sin!’—P. 6.

But Bishop Colenso was not long able to “throw dust in the eyes of his mind,” or do violence to the love of truth in this way. As his mental powers and general knowledge expanded, he felt it was impossible to maintain the extreme view of the inspiration of the Bible which he had formerly held. He took refuge in the distinction which, to many others as well as to him, has appeared to afford a sufficient solution of all similar difficulties—the distinction, namely, between *matters of faith and doctrine* on the one hand, and *matters of science and history* on the other. He conceived that there was, in the Scriptures, “*infallible divine teaching in all things spiritual and heavenly* ; whilst, on matters of history or daily life, prophets and evangelists were suffered to write as men.” His labours, however, as a Missionary Bishop, a translator of the Bible into the language of the Zulus among whom he lived, and an instructor of intelligent converts from heathenism, compelled him to undertake a more deep and searching inquiry into this vital point, and the questions connected with and springing from it. The result was, that he “arrived at the conviction—as painful to himself at first as it may be to his readers, though painful now no longer, under the clear shining light of truth—that the Pentateuch, as a whole, cannot possibly have been written by Moses, or by any one acquainted personally with the facts it professes to describe ; and further, that the (so called) Mosaic narrative, by whomsoever written, and though imparting to us, as he fully believes it does, revelations of the Divine Will and Character, cannot be regarded as *historically true*.”—(P. 8.)

Dr. Colenso explains that the difficulties which forced this conclusion upon his mind are not petty discrepancies which may be explained by supposing that we are ignorant of all the circumstances of the case, or that some displacement, alteration, or interpolation has taken place in the original text. Neither do they consist in the usual objections to the record, arising from the opposition between its statements respecting the creation and the deluge, and the discoveries of modern science. They are not connected with the miracles recorded to have happened at the time of the Exodus from Egypt, and on other occasions. They are not grounded on the trivial nature of many of the injunctions respecting ceremonial minutiae, which are described as having proceeded directly from the mouth of God.

"They are not even such as must be started at once in most pious minds, when such words as these are read, professedly coming from the Holy and Blessed One, the Father and Faithful Creator of all mankind:—*'If the master (of a Hebrew servant) have given him a wife, and she have borne him sons or daughters, the wife and her children shall be her master's, and he shall go out free by himself:'* (Exod. xxi. 4)—the wife and children, in such a case, being placed under the protection of such other words as these:—*'If a man smite his servant or his maid with a rod, and he die under his hand, he shall surely be punished. Notwithstanding, if he continue a day or two, he shall not be punished, for he is his money,'* (Exod. xxi. 20, 21). I shall never forget the revulsion of feeling with which a very intelligent Christian native, with whose help I was translating these words into the Zulu tongue, first heard them, as words said to be uttered by the same Great and Gracious Being whom I was teaching him to trust in and adore. His whole soul revolted against the notion that the Great and Blessed God, the Merciful Father of all mankind, would speak of a servant or a maid as mere 'money:' and allow a horrible crime to go unpunished, because the victim of the brutal outrage had survived a few hours. My own heart and conscience at the time fully sympathized with his. But I then clung to the notion that the main substance of the narrative was true; and I relieved his difficulty and my own, for the present, by telling him that I supposed such words as these were written down by Moses, and believed by him to have been divinely given to him, because the thought of them arose in his heart, as he conceived, by the inspiration of God: and that hence, to all such laws he prefixed the formula—*'Jehovah said unto Moses,'* without it being on that account necessary for us to suppose that they were actually spoken by the Almighty. This was, however, a very great strain upon the cord which bound me to the ordinary belief in the historical veracity of the Pentateuch; and since then, the cord has snapped in twain altogether."—(Pp. 9, 10.)

The Bishop is very earnest in disclaiming any reluctance to receive miracles, or narratives recording them, when alleged as adjuncts and proofs of divine revelations; provided they be sufficiently vouched by credible testimony. He "could receive and believe the miracles of Scripture heartily, if only they were authenticated by a veracious history:" though, of course, if the Pentateuch be not such a history, those miracles which rest upon its support must of necessity fall to the ground. He says:—

"The conviction of the unhistorical character of the (so-called) Mosaic narrative seems to be forced upon us by the consideration of the many absolute impossibilities involved in it, when treated as relating simple matters of fact, and without taking account of any argument which throws discredit on the story, merely by reason of the miracles or supernatural appearances recorded in it, or particular laws, speeches, and actions ascribed in it to the Divine Being. We need only consider well the statements made in the books themselves, by whomsoever written, about matters which they profess to narrate as facts of common history,—statements which every clergyman, at all events, and every Sunday-school teacher, not to say every Christian, is surely bound to examine thoroughly, and try to understand rightly, comparing one passage with another, until he comprehends their actual meaning, and is able to explain that meaning to others. If we do this, we shall find them to contain a series of manifest contradictions, which leave us, it would seem, no alternative but to conclude that main portions of the story of the Exodus,—though based probably on some real historical foundation,—yet are certainly not to be regarded as historically true."—(Pp. 11.)

These observations sufficiently indicate the nature of the evidence on which Bishop Colenso relies for the proof of his thesis. His argument is built on a mutual comparison of the facts which are recorded in the Pentateuch as *ordinary occurrences*; on the impossibility of reconciling these facts with each other; on the impossibility of believing that statements so diametrically opposed to each other should be, all of them, correct; and the strong improbability of their having proceeded from a writer who possessed even a moderate acquaintance with the times of which the narrative treats. Of course, if these points be proved the writer could not have been Moses, nor indeed any of his contemporaries.

The Bishop is well aware of the wide divergence between these views and those which are popularly entertained; he was quite prepared for the outcry with which

they have been assailed; and had even taken steps towards the publication of his book at a time when he thought that the consequence of its appearance might be the loss of his bishopric, and his expulsion from the Church of England. "For myself," he said, in a letter to a friend, written some time ago, but not sent (for causes which he fully explains), "if I cannot find means of doing away with my present difficulties, I see not how I can retain my episcopal office, in the discharge of which I must require from others a solemn declaration that they 'unfeignedly believe all the canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testament;' which, with the evidence now before me, it is impossible wholly to believe in," (p. xii). This was written before the judgment of Dr. Lushington, in the cases of Dr. Williams and Mr. Wilson, had given an authoritative exposition of the formula in the Service for the Ordination of Deacons, which sets the Bishop's scruples at rest; at least, if he acquiesces in its soundness. But although he may have nothing now to fear from the Court of Arches, it is plain to every one else, and we suppose to Bishop Colenso himself, that he has nothing to expect from the Court of St. James's. Such clergymen as he are not those whom statesmen and politicians delight to honour, or to advance to the high places in the Church. There is an impassable barrier between Natal and Canterbury. For the satisfaction of his own conscience, for the benefit of the Church, and the promotion of Christianity, he has sacrificed much in prospect, and was willing to sacrifice much in possession. Surely such a man deserves a better fate than to be assailed with clamour and obloquy, as if he were a reckless enemy to the Gospel!

It is time to indicate, by a few examples, the nature of the arguments advanced in the body of the work, as proving—*first*, that Moses was not the writer of the Pentateuch; and *secondly*, that the Pentateuch itself cannot be accepted as a reliable history of facts. We shall give Dr. Colenso's arguments, but not exactly in the order in which he gives them. With some of them we do not concur; and some of them appear very weak. But with the greater number of them we are in full accordance; and have no hesitation in stating that the conclusions at which he has arrived appear to us irrefutable.

It is somewhat unfortunate that Dr. Colenso opens the discussion with an argument which has no bearing at all on the question whether Moses wrote the books which pass under his name ; and must be admitted to be inconclusive with reference to the other proposition which he has undertaken to establish. It is built upon the account given of Judah and his posterity at the time when the Israelites “went down into Egypt.” The narrative in Genesis leads us to believe that Judah was not then a very old man—(Gen. xxix. 35 ; xxx. 24, 26 ; xli. 46, 53 ; xlii, xliii., xliv.)—certainly under fifty years of age ; Bishop Colenso thinks he was only *forty-two*. But among those who accompanied him in that journey were his grandsons, Hezron and Hamul. (Gen. xli. 12, and elsewhere.) Now, from the family history given in Gen. xxxviii., it appears that Judah *might* have had a grandson of the same age with his son Pharez, the father of Hezron and Hamul. The whole narrative, therefore, leads to the conclusion that Judah might have been a great-grandfather at the early age above specified. This the Bishop pronounces to be “certainly incredible.” We admit that it is unusual to find, in the same family, three persons in succession each of whom had become a father at the early age of fourteen or fifteen years. But, as Dr. Priestley remarks, (in his note on Gen. xlii. 12), “the thing is not absolutely impossible”—and the Doctor was a good physiologist, as well as a fearless critic. At all events, Dr. Colenso’s argument, allowing to it all the force that he can claim for it, does not prove that Moses was not the author of the Pentateuch ; but only that the Pentateuch, by whomsoever written, contains a slight historical mistake : that of placing among the Israelites, who were born in Canaan, the names of two persons who were not born till after the family had settled in Egypt. It was scarcely worth while to make a mountain of such a molehill.

The case, however, is quite different with reference to the accounts given of events that happened in the time of Moses himself. If these are incredible in themselves, and irreconcilable with each other, we cannot suppose the narrative to have proceeded from his pen, for no writer

possessed of common sense would take the trouble to compose and publish an elaborate history like this, if he knew that every man and woman of that generation could prove it to be a tissue of fabrications. Here, also, it is to be regretted that some of the points brought forward by the Bishop are capable of a solution which blunts the edge of his argument. The introduction of such topics leaves upon the reader's mind an impression that the author is over-anxious to accumulate proofs of his proposition. The employment of a bad argument sometimes weakens the force of a good one. We conceive that his conclusion is well borne out; but we cannot admit that all the reasons which he adduces in its support are equally cogent. Some of them we regard as of little or no force. We have also to regret, in his method of marshalling his arguments, a want of that *lucidus ordo* which is so helpful to a candid inquirer, and which is so important in a work intended to combat popular prejudice on a deeply interesting question. We have examined this book carefully, with a view to discover the principle of arrangement which has guided the Bishop in placing one argument *first*, another *second*, *third*, &c., but we can find none. It is not the principle of logical dependence; neither is it that of chronological sequence; it is not even that of priority of mention in the narrative itself; it certainly is not that of importance, for he begins with one that is, in our opinion, frivolous. In short, the various topics seem to have been taken up in a chance-medley way; in the order in which they happened to present themselves to his mind. It never seems to have occurred to him that there is any advantage or propriety in mentioning any one fact or argument before or after another: or any possibility of so placing all the facts and arguments that the one shall lead to the other, and each theorem be supported by the theorem which preceded. It is not thus that books are written which are destined for immortality. Though this paper is only intended for the ephemeral existence of an article in a magazine, we shall consult the reader's convenience and our own by placing the Bishop's arguments in what appears to us a consecutive and logical form.

The grand objection to the Mosaic,—or what is called

the Mosaic,—history of the Exodus, is built upon the enormous numbers assigned in the Pentateuch to the Hebrew population at that time.

Jacob and his descendants who established themselves in Egypt, were, in all, *seventy persons*—(Gen. xlv. 27 ; Exod. i. 5 ; Deut. x. 22)—of whom two were females. Jacob had no children after he settled in that country ; and of his twelve sons, only one (Levi) had a child born to him in Egypt, and she was a daughter. Deducting these fifteen, there remain fifty-five males who were, or became, heads of families. Again, it is somewhat above the average of families to suppose that each father should leave behind him *three full-grown sons*, besides daughters, and sons who may have died in infancy. This is the average of the thirteen families mentioned in Exod. vi. 14, 15 ; which may be taken as indicating the rate of increase of the nation in Egypt. Now the Pentateuch itself records a prophecy (Gen. xv. 16) that the Israelites should return into Canaan “ *in the fourth generation ;* ” and the pedigrees of Moses and Aaron, of Mishaël, Elzaphan, and Korah, of Nemuel, Dathan, and Abiram, (Exod. vi. 16–20 ; Lev. x. 4 ; Num. xxvi. 5–9) agree with this ; for these men were all members of the third generation, that which departed from Egypt and perished in the wilderness. Their children crossed the Jordan with Joshua. Allowing three sons to every father of the fifty-five, there would be, of the second generation, 165 males ; and of the third, 495. Supposing, moreover, that all the males, both of the second and third generations, were living at the time of the Exodus, *there could be no more than six hundred and sixty male Israelites alive*, including old men and young children, *at that time*. And this is a large calculation. But the history expressly affirms that when the Exodus took place there were “ *about 600,000 men, besides children,* ” (Exod. xii. 37, and elsewhere). This implies a total population of *at least 1,000,000 males, and as many females* ; a perfectly incredible rate of increase,—unless we allow with Bishop Patrick,—but in opposition to nature, experience, and common sense ; in opposition even to the examples recorded in the narrative itself,—that the Hebrew women might, “ *by the extraordinary blessing of God,* ” bring forth, on the average, “ *six children at a time !* ”

which, of course, requires that some must have occasionally brought forth a far greater number. Nor is this a mere solitary statement, in which we might suppose an error to have occurred in transcription,—by writing, for example, 600,000 instead of 600,—for the number is several times repeated. Sometimes the particulars of the different tribes are given, and these make up the whole sum exactly; (Exod. xii. 37; xxxviii. 26; Num. i. 19–46; ii. 32; xi. 24; xxvi. 51). It is, in fact, “very stuff” of the history, and cannot be separated from it. The increase of the posterity of Dan surpasses all the rest in its incredibility. He had but one son, Hushim; hence, in the third generation his male descendants might have amounted, under ordinary circumstances, to the number of nine or ten; or if we suppose, as an extreme case, that Hushim had ten sons who grew to manhood, and that each of them had as many—(leaving daughters out of the account),—the posterity of Dan might number 110 warriors. But the history tells us that they amounted to 62,700 when the census was taken, in Num. ii. 26; and a few months afterwards, to 64,400! Think of one man, Hushim, having 64,400 *sons and grandsons*! An equally glaring inconsistency is found on comparing the males who were the first-born of their respective mothers with the total number of males in Israel. The former were 22,273 (Num. iii. 43); the latter, as we have seen, must have amounted to not less than 1,000,000: that is, there was only one first-born for every forty-four males. This might seem to imply that every mother had forty-four sons; but as the cases in which the first-born was a daughter would probably be nearly as many as those in which it would be a son, and as the total of males and females would be about 2,000,000, we must double both the numbers given above; and then we find, as before, that *every mother in Israel must have had, on the average, rather more than forty-four children, sons and daughters*! Now we agree with Bishop Colenso, that no tribe of women on the face of the earth ever approached this degree of fertility. It is manifest, therefore, that these numbers are of no historical value whatever. They must be gross exaggerations. To suppose that Moses wrote the narrative in which they are found, and of which they constitute

the essence, is to suppose him to be void of common sense ; for all the men who came with him out of Egypt, and their children, must have known that these assertions were destitute of foundation.

It is useless to dwell at any length upon the replies that are usually given to these arguments. Sometimes we are told that the practice of polygamy gives rise to large families ; but the narrative itself, when it speaks of individual families, shews that they were not of any extraordinary size. Joseph had *two sons* ; Levi had *three* and a daughter ; one of these, Gershon, had *two* ; another, Kohath, *four* ; and the third, Merari, *three*. One of the sons of Kohath, was Amram, the father of Moses ; and he had *two sons* and a daughter. Aaron, the brother of Moses, had *four sons* ; Moses himself had *two*. Korah, one of the sons of Aaron, had *three sons* ; Eleazar, his brother, had but *one*. It appears, therefore, that the families of which records have been preserved were by no means enormously large ; and these numbers are the more important in this argument, as they chiefly relate to the posterity of Levi, who was the great-grandfather of Moses by the father's side ; his grandfather by his mother's. It will not be contended that *Moses* recorded imperfectly or incorrectly the households of his own brother, father, grandfather, uncles, and nephews. Moreover, polygamy tends to diminish rather than to increase the populations among whom it prevails ; for although it allows to the wealthy a plurality of wives, it condemns the greater part of the poor men to a life of celibacy. Sometimes a man may have many wives, and yet have but a small family. Solomon, who is said to have had a harem of a thousand wives and concubines, was the father of only one son. If each of these women had been married in monogamy, it is probable that their offspring would have amounted to three or four thousand. Besides, it is quite plain that polygamy could not have been practised to any extent among the Israelites during the time that they were reduced to slavery. They had neither the means of procuring nor of maintaining households of many wives for themselves. Neither would their taskmasters furnish them with wives ; for their whole dread was, lest they

should multiply too rapidly, and so gain the mastery of the kingdom.

Another answer is drawn from the length of time during which the Israelites dwelt in Egypt. It was, according to the lowest calculation, founded on the Pentateuch itself, two hundred and fifteen years; and it is maintained that during this long period the posterity of Jacob might have multiplied to the total of 2,000,000. But this would require the population to have doubled itself once in every fourteen years throughout the whole period, which no nation has ever done, even under the most favourable circumstances; unless, like Australia, it be assisted largely by immigration. But the Jews were so far from being favourably circumstanced that they were reduced to abject and rigorous servitude—their male children being, for a part of the time, sought for, and, when found, put to death, by order of the King of Egypt. Besides, it is not so much the number of years as that of generations which is to be considered in such a case; and experience shews that great longevity has little or no effect in increasing the population.

The last supposition is, that the generations were probably much more numerous than the record shews: only the more important links of the chain being specified. But no man can read the 6th chapter of Exodus without perceiving that the writer professes and means to give a *full* genealogy of the family of Levi, to which Moses and Aaron belonged; and, as the other pedigrees correspond sufficiently with this, it follows that only three generations are represented by the writer of the Pentateuch as having intervened between the coming down of Israel into Egypt and the departure of his posterity from it. And, as the number of 215 years, assigned to these three generations, transcends all the ordinary calculations founded on the experience of human life, it only adds another difficulty to the many which beset this narrative.

We regard the enormous numbers ascribed to the Israelites at the time of their departure from Egypt as the primary error of the historian, and therefore we have placed it first in our analysis of Bishop Colenso's work. From the first mistake, arise many difficulties and contradictions, several of which the Bishop points out with

clearness, and reasons upon with force. We must reserve the consideration of them for a paper in our next *Christian Unitarian*, in which we shall shew wherein we differ from the views which he has taken; and also endeavour to explain what is, in our opinion, the just inference to be deduced from the whole state of the facts, soundly and impartially considered.

J. S. P.

CONGREGATIONAL MEMOIRS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CHRISTIAN UNITARIAN.

SIR,—In addition to the printed books from which I have derived assistance in the preparation of the few Congregational Memoirs with which I am about to trouble you, and to which reference is made in the course of the narrative, I have had access to the following original sources of information, viz. :—

1. A copy made by myself of the *Adair MS.*, which is now in the possession of Rev. W. Bruce, Belfast. This MS. is described by Dr. Reid, in his History of the Presbyterian Church, at i. 205 (note), ii. 398 (note), 409 (note). The Doctor has made large use of this valuable record; in fact it is the foundation of a considerable portion of his work.

2. A certified copy made for myself of the *Stewart MS.*, also described by Reid, i. 81 (note), which was written by the Rev. Andrew Stewart, Minister of Donaghadee, 1645 to 1671, and which is preserved in the Advocates' Library, Edinburgh.

3. Minutes of the Antrim Meeting, 1671 to 1675, and 1683 to 1691. This old manuscript volume, after surviving many dangers of flood and field, is now, in its present mutilated form, my property.

4. All the minutes (so far as I am aware) which are now extant, of the Presbytery of Templepatrick from 1745 to the present day, together with rough minutes of visitation Presbyteries, and other loose papers. These minutes are far from being complete, but such as they are, I am indebted for the use of them to two kind neighbours of a different Church from my own—Rev. W. J. Raphael, of Ballyeaston, and Rev. W. Campbell, of Islandmagee. To the minutes of the Presbytery of Antrim I have neither had, nor asked, access. But from what I have seen of some volumes of these minutes, when they were in charge of my brother, Mr. Scott Porter, the former Clerk of that Presbytery, I

do not think that my loss, with reference to my present object, has been great. I do really believe the grapes *are* sour.

5. Miscellaneous MS. collections made on this, and on other subjects, by the late Mr. M'Skimin, the Historian of Carrickfergus, and purchased by me from his son and executor, after his decease.

6. A similar collection made by myself; and

7. Lastly, in some few cases, congregational and sessional records, and in still fewer cases, local tradition.

The extracts which I shall make from the old minutes may, in some cases, appear to be unimportant; but, perhaps, with a few of your readers, the quaintness of the expression will excuse the triviality of the record.—I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

CLASSON PORTER.

LARNE, Jan. 14, 1863.

BALLYCARRY (OR BROADISLAND) CONGREGATION.

SUCCESSION OF MINISTERS.

1613—1636. EDWARD BRICE, M.A.; with HENRY COLVERT as Assistant in 1629 and 1630.

[A vacancy of ten years, supplied occasionally from Scotland.]

1646—1697. ROBERT CUNNINGHAM.

— 1759. JAMES CORHAM.

[A vacancy of four years.]

1763—1833. JOHN BANKHEAD.

1812—1853. WILLIAM GLENDY.

1852—1854. THOMAS O'GORMAN.

1854. MOORE GETTY.

THE Congregation of Ballycarry, or (as it was formerly called, from the district of country in which it is situated, and which lies midway between Larne and Carrickfergus) Broadisland, is commonly supposed to be the oldest Presbyterian Congregation in Ireland. And there is no doubt that, in point of time, it was the first Congregation in Ulster which, in the beginning of the 17th century, was settled with a minister from Scotland. But it should be borne in mind that up to 1661 its ministers, like those of the other Presbyterian Congregations of the day, although undoubtedly and avowedly Presbyterians, yet submitted, after a fashion, to Episcopal ordination; and although using the Presbyterian form of worship, yet officiated in their respective parish churches, and therefore their names appear on the Visitation Books of the Diocese of Down and Connor. And with respect to the meeting-house of

Ballycarry, no claim to superior antiquity can be maintained on its behalf, for it will appear, in the course of the following record, that "the want of a preaching-house in Ballycarry" was felt so late as 1673, and we know, from other sources, that meeting-houses began to be generally built in the Province of Ulster in 1668.

I.—EDWARD BRICE, M.A., 1613—1636, the first minister of Broadisland, had been minister for many years of Drymen in Stirlingshire, before coming to Ireland. He was obliged to quit Scotland in consequence of the opposition which he gave to Episcopacy in 1607, and, directing his views to Ireland (like many of his countrymen in those days), he appears to have been attracted towards Broadisland by the circumstance that his former neighbour, Sir William Edmunstone, "7th Laird of the antient honourable family of Duntreath" (who in 1606 had joined with Sir Hugh Montgomery of Braidstane, in the Plantation of the Ards in the County Down, but in 1609 sold his interest therein), had, in the latter year, "settled his family in Broadisland, and there built two slated houses on the Dalway's Estate, near Carrickfergus.* Owing, probably, to the influence of his patron, Brice was received and acknowledged by Echlin, who was the Bishop of Down and Connor, and who was himself a Scotchman. This reception and recognition were in all probability the same which had been awarded by the same Bishop to Mr. Blair, the minister of Bangor (County Down), as detailed by Blair in the following words—"I answered the Bishop that his sole ordination did utterly contradict my principles; but he replied both wittily and submis-

* "May 28, 1609, John Dalway made a fee-farm lease for ever of the lands of Braidenisland, containing 2,870 acres, to William Edmunstone, Laird of Duntreath, at the yearly rent of £160 9s. 4d., being one mark Scotch per acre. In this deed Edmunstone was bound to furnish five able horsemen, properly equipped, to attend every year for forty days the general testings of the Lord Deputy. He was also bound to furnish five days' labour of his tenants and horses, to draw timber and slates for a castle about to be built by John Dalway near Ballynure, and within five years to build a mansion of lyme and stone, covered with slate, which shall cost in the building £300. In the same deed, twelve acres of good arable pasture and meadow land are also granted for ever, to be annexed as glebeable land to and for the Parish Church of Templecoran.—*M^r Skimin's Carrickfergus*, p. 395, on the authority of a Manuscript.

sively, 'Whatever you account of Episcopacy, yet I know you account a Presbytery to have divine warrant. Will you not receive ordination from the adjacent brethren, and let me come in among them in no other relation than a Presbyter?' This I could not refuse; and so the matter was performed." Under these circumstances, Brice, in the year 1613, began his stated ministry in Broadisland; and M'Skimin, in his History of Carrickfergus (p. 332, note), mentions a tradition that "he preached alternately in the Parish of Templecorran, *alias* Braidisland, and in the Church of Ballykeel, Islandmagee." In September, 1619, he was promoted by Echlin to be Prebendary of Killroot (a position which was afterwards occupied by Dean Swift), but his new dignity, which was merely nominal, neither interfered with his previous settlement in Broadisland, nor induced him to renounce for a moment his Presbyterian principles. In the Ulster Visitation Book of 1622, as given by Dr. Reid in the appendix to the first volume of his History of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland, I find the following entry:— "Templecorran, or Ballycarry, also called Broadisland. Edward Brice, M.A., serveth the cures of Templecorran and Killroot. Church at Killroot decayed: that at Ballycarry has the walls newly erected, but not roofed." Livingstone (of Killinchy), in his "Memorable Characteristics" appended to his "Life," speaks of Mr. Brice (whom, by the way, he describes as having formerly been a minister at Dumbarton) as being in 1629 "an aged man, who came not much abroad;" in corroboration of which description I may mention the fact, recorded by Blair (of Bangor) in his Life, p. 66, that on a Communion Sunday in Templepatrick, in 1630, Mr. Brice, although present, was unable to fulfil his appointment to preach; and Mr. Blair, who had already preached several times on that Communion occasion, was obliged to officiate in his stead. During these two years, 1629 and 1630, Mr. Brice seems to have had, as his assistant, Mr. Henry Colvert, who was afterwards minister of Oldstone, or Muckamore. In 1632, probably through his acquaintance with Bishop Echlin, the minister of Broadisland escaped the indignity of being silenced by that functionary, as were Messrs. Livingstone, Blair, Dunbar (of Larne), and

Welsh (of Templepatrick). But in 1636, under a new Bishop (Leslie) he was not so fortunate. That Bishop, on occasion of his primary visitation at Lisburn, in the month of July, 1636, required from all his clergy (in which category the Presbyterian ministers were then included) their subscription of the Canons of the Church. Nine of them, including Mr. Brice, refused to comply; and as they continued obstinate, notwithstanding a private and apparently friendly conference with their Bishop, Leslie summoned all his clergy to meet him in the Church at Belfast, on the 10th of August, where the Presbyterian ministers attended, and were edified by a discourse from their Diocesan, who took as his text these ominous words — “*But if he neglect to hear the Church, let him be unto thee as a heathen man and a publican.*” A conference so begun on the side of authority, was not likely to end in reconciliation. On the following day, Thursday, August 11th, the Bishop condescended to discuss the entire question with his recusant clergy, in the presence of a large assembly of the nobility, gentry, and clergy of the diocese. In this singular and interesting discussion, Mr. Brice, owing probably to his age, took no personal part; it being conducted, on behalf of the recusants, mainly by Mr. Hamilton of Ballywalter. It had the usual result of such discussions. Neither party was convinced; and accordingly, on the following day, “Friday, the 12th day of August, at 9 o’clock in the forenoon, 1636,” the Bishop having called before him the rebellious ministers, and suitably addressed them, formally passed upon them “the five several sentences of perpetual silence within his diocese.” On this occasion, the honour of priority in deposition was given to Mr. Brice. Of the five, he was silenced first, and soon after, the silence was indeed made “perpetual.” The old man, deposed, but not degraded, scarcely survived his deposition. He returned (says Reid) from Belfast, oppressed with the thought of being compelled to resign the beloved exercise of his ministry, and before any steps could be taken by Leslie to carry his sentence into effect, this venerable minister resigned both life and office into the hands of the Great Shepherd and Bishop of souls. The inscription on his tombstone, which may still be seen at the old church in Ballycarry, is as

follows :—"Near this lyeth the body of that faithful and emenent servant of God, Mr. Edward Brice, who begun preaching of the Gospel in this parish 1613, continuing with quiet success till 1636, in which he died, aged 67, and left two sons and two daughters." Livingstone, in the passage above referred to, says of Mr. Brice, that "in all his preaching, he insisted most on the life of Christ in the heart, and the light of his Word and Spirit on the mind, that being his own continual exercise." With respect to the descendants of the first minister of Ballycarry, I may add, on the authority of M'Skimin's History of Carrickfergus (p. 333, note 3), that his eldest son, Robert, resided at Castle Chichester, where he acquired a fortune, probably by trading to Scotland, Castle Chichester being then a place of some trade, and the station from which the mails were despatched to that kingdom. For many generations, the Brices of Killroot (for such was the name of their family property) occupied a very respectable position among the gentry of County Antrim; but in 1851 Killroot was sold, and added to the contiguous estate of Mr. Dobbs of Castle Dobbs. The late Mr. Brice thought proper to change his name to Bruce (his immediate ancestors having previously renounced their Presbyterian faith); and all the memento which now remains, in the neighbourhood where he preached, of the first minister of Broadisland is the appellation of Brice, which is still found as a Christian name in the families of some of the local peasantry.*

With respect to Mr. Henry Colvert, who, as above stated, acted as assistant to Mr. Brice in Broadisland, during the years 1629 and 1630, it is only necessary to mention, in this place, that he also had been episcopally ordained by Knox of Raphoe, in 1629; that after assisting Mr. Brice for a short time, he was, on the 17th of June, 1630, and on the presentation of Roger Langford, Esq., admitted to the cure of the parish of Oldstone, or Muckamore, near Antrim; that, in 1636, he was, with the other Presbyterian Ministers, deposed by Leslie, and

* See Reid's History of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland, Vol. i., pp. 98, 188, 193, 201, 434, *et seq.* The Montgomery Manuscript, p. 48. Memoirs of the Life of Mr. Robert Blair, of Bangor, pp. 52 and 66. M'Skimin's History of Carrickfergus, 3rd Edition, p. 332, note 3. Livingstone's Life and Memorable Characteristics, p. 89.

that he returned to Scotland, where he was ordained minister of Paisley, in which charge he died. Livingstone says that "Mr. Henry Colvert was one who very pertinently cited much Scripture in his sermons, and frequently urged private fasting and prayer." Blair also says of him—"This able minister having been of a fervent spirit, and vehement delivery in preaching, and withal very diligent, he was a blessing to his people."*

Mr. Brice and Mr. Colvert doubtless took part in the monthly meetings at Antrim, and in the revivals at Oldstone and the Six-mile-water. But a description of these interesting occurrences in the early history of Irish Presbyterianism is deferred until we come to the history of the two congregations—Antrim and Ballyclare—which had a more immediate local connexion with them. My object is to make these memoirs as much as possible congregational.

(To be continued.)

FAITH IN DIVINE GOODNESS.

He sendeth sun, He sendeth shower,
Alike they're needful to the flower,
And joys and tears alike are sent
To give the soul fit nourishment.
As comes to me or cloud or sun,
Father, Thy will, not mine, be done!

Can loving children e'er reprove
With murmurs, whom they trust and love?
Creator, I would ever be
A trusting, loving child to Thee.
As comes to me, or cloud or sun,
Father, Thy will, not mine, be done!

Oh ne'er will I at life repine!
Enough, that Thou hast made it mine.
When falls the shadow cold of death,
I yet will sing, with parting breath,
As comes to me or cloud or sun,
Father, Thy will, not mine, be done!—S. F. ADAMS.

* See Reid i. 115. Livingstone, p. 88. Blair's Life, p. 63.

WHAT THE SCRIPTURES TEACH.—No. 1.

[We propose to exhibit, in a few brief articles, the Scripture testimony on which the leading doctrines of Christian Unitarianism rest, and thus to show, for the information of inquirers, the grounds on which we dissent from prevailing opinions, and embrace an unpopular faith.]

THE Scriptures teach that *God is one*. From the numerous texts which set forth this fundamental truth, we select the following:—"Hear, O Israel; the Lord our God is one Lord."—Deut. vi. 4. "Unto thee will I sing with the harp, O thou Holy One of Israel."—Ps. lxxi. 22. "The Holy One of Israel."—Isaiah xxxvii. 23. "Jesus answered, The first of all the commandments is, Hear, O Israel; the Lord our God is one Lord."—Mark xii. 29. "Now a mediator is not a mediator of one, but God is one." Gal. iii. 20.—"There is one God."—1 Tim. ii. 5, "Thou believest that there is one God; thou doest well."—Jas. ii. 19.

Although the word signifying "God" is plural in the Hebrew language, most probably to express dignity or excellence, it is not so in other languages. We find that prophets, as Moses, David, and Daniel, always spoke of God, and prayed to Him as one person, and so also did Jesus Christ, who never, in any word that he utters, or any expression that he employs, teaches that God is more than one person.

The Scriptures teach that *God is the Father*, thus expressing our dependence on Him, and His love for us. "Have we not all one Father? hath not one God created us?"—Mal. ii. 10. "Grace to you, and peace from God our Father."—Rom. i. 7. "The Father of mercies, and the God of all comfort."—2 Cor. i. 3. Jesus Christ continually speaks of God as the Father. "One is your Father, which is in heaven."—Mat. xxiii. 9. "Your Father knoweth what things ye have need of."—Mat. vi. 8. "It is not the will of your Father that one of these little ones should perish."—Mat. xviii. 14. So he speaks of Him continually as *his* Father. "Therefore doth my Father love me."—John x. 17. "My Father which gave them me is greater than all."—John x. 29. "My Father is greater than I."—John xiv. 28. "I ascend to my Father and your Father."—John xx. 17.

The Scriptures teach that we should pray to God as the Father. "Pray to thy Father which is in secret."—Mat. vi. 6. "When ye pray, say, Our Father which art in Heaven."—Luke xi. 2. "The true worshippers shall worship the Father."—John iv. 23. "Whatsoever ye shall ask the Father in my name, He will give it you."—John xvi. 23. "I bow my knees unto the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ."—Eph. iii. 14.

The Scriptures teach that *the Father is the only true God*. "To us there is but one God, the Father, of whom are all things, and we in him."—1 Cor. viii. 6. In the solemn language of prayer addressed to the Father, our Lord says—"This is life eternal, that they might know Thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent."—John xvii. 3.

The Scriptures do not mention a Trinity, or teach that God subsists in Three Persons. By a figure of speech, sometimes used even now, two persons or more are represented as *one*; thus, God and Christ are said to be one (John x. 30), and so also Paul and Apollos (1 Cor. iii. 8), and Jews and Gentiles in Christ (Eph. ii. 14). But it is nowhere said that two persons, or three, are *one being*. The Scriptures teach that baptism is to be administered in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit; but it is not said, or even implied, that the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, are one God.

GLEANINGS FROM THE "BIBLE CHRISTIAN."

THIRTY-THREE years have now elapsed since the first number of the *Bible Christian* saw the light—a period almost equal to the average duration of human life: and although some of the editors and contributors, and many of the numerous readers of that magazine still survive, who could well bear testimony to its character and worth, yet many have fallen asleep; and even to the survivors time must naturally have dimmed the memory of special events recorded in the pages with which they were once so familiar. Moreover, there has sprung up in the interval a new generation in connection with our churches, of whom it would be safe to say that few have ever seen

the *Bible Christian*, and fewer still have read it with attention. For the information, then, of such of our readers as may require it, we may state that the monthly periodical in question was projected shortly after the Remonstrant separation from the General Synod, by several of the Remonstrants "and other friends of religious truth and liberty;" that it quickly obtained a most extensive circulation, not alone in Ireland, but through the Three Kingdoms; that it numbered amongst its contributors many of the most eminent and enlightened members, lay and clerical, of the Non-Subscribing Churches in this country, whose powerful writings, in advocacy and defence of their Scriptural principles in times of vehement controversy, were read with avidity by multitudes far and near; that it continued to be, during *thirteen* years, the recognized organ of our Churches in the North of Ireland—the powerful and consistent exponent of the doctrines of Bible Christianity, pure and simple, by which they were distinguished; and that it proved itself to the last the fearless, uncompromising, and successful defender of Christian liberty and Christian truth.

We purpose, in the present article, to give two brief extracts from the Intelligence department of the *Bible Christian*, of no literary excellence, but possessing the merit of being faithful reports, and interesting as they bear on the peculiar circumstances of our Churches at the present day.

The first is taken from the number for November, 1838, (Vol. iii., New Series, p. 364), and is as follows:—

"ORDINATION AT CARRICKFERGUS.—On Thursday, October 4th, the Rev. James Nixon Porter, son of the Rev. William Porter, of Newtownlimavady, was ordained by the Remonstrant Presbytery of Templepatrick to the pastoral charge of the Presbyterian Congregation of Carrickfergus, in connexion with that body. On this occasion a sermon was preached by the Rev. George Hill, of Crumlin. The Rev. William Glendy, of Ballycarry, defended Presbyterian ordination, *and put the usual questions*; and the Rev. W. Porter, of Newtownlimavady, delivered the charge to the young minister and people."

The report is simple enough, yet somewhat suggestive, and rather calculated to shock our enlightened sensibilities, in this modern, improved, go-ahead time of "*no questions asked*." What could these "*usual questions*" have been? Well, perhaps it will be a little provoking to some of our

“Free Inquirers” to have such an awkward piece of intelligence turning up just at this time ; but, if they are really anxious to know what were the “usual questions,” we are happy to be able to give them full, if not satisfactory, information. We beg to refer them to the Old Code of Discipline, published in 1825, and solemnly adopted by the Remonstrant Synod, in 1830, as the Discipline of their Church, and which remained as such, in full and undisputed force, till 1857. In this Code, p. 38, amongst the Rules for Ordination, the 8th is the following :—

“He (the candidate) shall then, *for the satisfying of the Presbytery and people*, be examined touching his belief in the heads of the Christian religion, and his future intentions of performing his duty in the Congregation. The examination shall be as follows :—

“Do you believe the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament to be the Word of God, and the only infallible rule of faith and practice ?

“Do you adhere to your subscription to the Westminster Confession of Faith, or (as the case may be) do you adhere to the declaration of religious belief made to your Presbytery at the time you were licensed ?”

Then follow three more very comprehensive questions as to the candidate’s intentions of performing his various ministerial duties, and his approval of, and determination to obey and support, the “Presbyterian Church government and discipline.”

“The answers,” it proceeds, “shall all be taken down, and entered on the Presbytery book. The candidate having *answered to the satisfaction of the Presbytery*, shall be set apart by prayer, and the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery.”

As regards installation, we are informed (p. 40) that “The same questions also shall be put to the person to be installed as to one about to be ordained . . . and all other rules observed as in case of ordination, except those which refer to the act of ordination.”

But what, then, was the nature of “the declaration of religious belief” previously made, to which the candidate for ordination or installation was asked did he adhere ? Let us turn to the rules for license (p. 28) :—

“2. Presbyteries, before they license candidates to preach the Gospel, *shall ascertain the soundness of their faith*, either by requiring

subscription to the Westminster Confession of Faith, *or by such examinations as they shall consider best adapted for this purpose.*

"3. The candidate having either subscribed the Westminster Confession, or given satisfactory answers to the Presbytery respecting his religious belief, shall be thus further interrogated:—

"Do you promise to study and endeavour to promote the peace, unity, and prosperity of the Presbyterian Church?"

"Do you promise to submit yourself, in the Lord, to the government of this Presbytery, or to any other Presbytery of the Synod of Ulster to which you may be transmitted?"

"The candidate having answered these two interrogations in the affirmative,"—shall then receive *License* to preach the Gospel in the form there prescribed.

"6. Should any candidate be licensed in violation of these rules, his license shall be withdrawn, and the member so licensing *shall be suspended for at least four Lord's days.*"

We hope, then, our "secession" friends at Carrickfergus and elsewhere, are pleased with the picture of a Remonstrant Ordination, and the "usual questions" required to be put under the Old Code, in the year of grace, 1838!

"Oh, yes," they may reply; "those are the Fundamental Principles of the Remonstrant Synod which we love. (See the Memorial and Resolution of the Carrickfergus Seceders.) But you, degenerate and faithless Remonstrants, have swerved from your integrity, have recklessly 'violated your public pledges and fundamental principles,' have, since 1857, been living in sin against liberty and the Old Code, and in your wretched New Code have attempted to limit the power and authority of Presbyteries, to prevent their requiring subscription to the Westminster Confession, or putting unlimited interrogatories to the applicant for license, and *one more* for ordination and installation, the 'usual questions' in which our hearts delighted. You have changed all this; you have confined them to your three simple questions—belief in God, in Christ, and the Scriptures; you have presumed thus to 'trample on the rights and liberties of the people.' (See Carrickfergus Memorial.) We abhor your tyranny; and we will seek a new home—even that asylum of the persecuted, the venerable Presbytery of Antrim, 'a body in which, for 136 years, the principles which we hold dear have been consistently maintained.'" (See Carrickfergus Resolution.)

But now we must address ourselves to what, we confess, is a very difficult task—to discover, if we can, what are the principles by which the Presbytery of Antrim may now be distinguished; or whether their present stage of development admits of the clear enunciation and consistent enforcement of any fixed principles whatever. They boast that they have no Code of Discipline, no written regulations to guide either themselves or others in such inquiry. We must then search for ourselves where and how we best can. We come at once, then, to the all-important *questio vexata*—their conditions of license, ordination, and installation. What are their “usual questions”? One—two—three—any number—or none at all? The three questions of the Remonstrant Code—belief in Christ, God, and the Scriptures—are all set aside.

The two questions, those of Mr. M'Alester's Resolution—belief in Christ, and the Scriptures, or an equivalent declaration—come next; but their fate is soon decided. They are “rejected with indignation,” though they take away with them for ever the very bone and sinew, the marrow and fatness, the *decus et tutamen*, of the whole body. What matters it? *Fiat justitia, ruat coelum*. Principle, the principle of 136 years, must be kept inviolate, though the sky fall!

The question has now narrowed itself to one, or else an indefinite number, an unknown quantity, on the one side; or to none at all on the other. Which shall it be? What says the Presbytery of Antrim? And where shall we find their deliverance? We naturally look to the ordinations or installations which have taken place in the Presbytery of Antrim since the separation of the Northern Presbytery, and to the discourses then delivered in “explanation and defence of Presbyterian Ordination.” Two such installations, we believe, there have been, at York Street, Belfast, and at Ravara. Of the discourse delivered by the Rev. H. Moore at Ravara, we confess we are able to make little or nothing. It is of the pure *non-description* type, into which the former non-subscription seems rapidly merging. At one time he turns to the candidate, and tells him that he would consider it an insult both to him and the congregation, which he is

satisfied they would both properly resent, if they were to ask him any questions as to his belief, whether in God, or Christ, or the Scriptures. And, anon, he astonishes him by declaring that, "While the Presbytery of Antrim has never, in any installation, put doctrinal tests to candidates for license, (*sic!*) ordination, or installation, but has contented itself by personal inquiry, or otherwise, as to the fitness of the person for the work in which he is about to engage, and especially whether, with Chillingworth, he takes the Bible as his creed, and regards the Scriptures as a sufficient rule of faith and practice, it has been the uniform practice to request the person chosen by the congregation to state, for the satisfaction of the congregation, and that there may be no ground for misapprehension hereafter, clearly and distinctly his views on entering on the work of the ministry, *and to answer any questions the congregation, or the installation ministers, may choose to put to him.*"

"Misapprehension hereafter!" We wish we could apprehend Mr. Moore himself in the present! But it is totally impossible. He elsewhere states that Ordination differs from Installation only in the outward form of laying on of hands; while in another part of the same discourse he distinctly reserves to the Presbytery, in conferring license, the most extensive powers of arbitrary questioning, such as the most "malignant tyrant" of the Remonstrants never dreamed of. If Mr. Moore did not know what he was saying, which in charity we must hope was the case, we can only say, "Who is this that darkeneth counsel by words without knowledge?" But if he did know, then we tell him deliberately that his discourse was a miserable sham, an *ad captandum* oration, to throw dust in the eyes of the public, and conceal the rotten foundations of a bad cause.

We turn next to the discourse of the Moderator, Mr. Nelson, at the installation in York Street, Feb. 5, 1862. Here, at least, no such plea can be alleged. Mr. Nelson knew well what he was saying; for the Moderator possesses in a remarkable degree the peculiar wisdom of the serpent, if not combined with the harmlessness of the dove. We admit that he skilfully applies the maxim of Talleyrand, that "language was given to conceal the

thoughts." But the thought will sometimes out notwithstanding; and in the present instance it shines clear through all its studied disguise, and may be thus embodied in words—"We wish to establish our Presbytery on the basis of *absolute non-interrogation*, if we can, and so to entice these stray congregations of the Remonstrants, misled by the cry of liberty; but we are afraid to state our purpose too openly, before the public are prepared for such extreme measures; we must gently lead them on."

How indignant is our friend, the Moderator, at such an imputation! Yet how else are we to construe his indignant refusal to "insult" the people of York Street Congregation by asking a single question of their minister elect?—his declaration that the Presbytery "came there merely as a court of order and assistance, at the request of the Congregation, to instal their pastor to his office, and to *witness* the solemn compact between him and the Congregation?"—and his announcement that, in that capacity, they cheerfully afforded him an opportunity of declaring his sentiments, if he wished, for the satisfaction of himself and the Congregation? This seems plain enough; and we are of opinion that even the Moderator has got caught at last, and now stands *pledged* to the principle of absolute non-interrogation. And if words are wind, facts at least are stubborn things; and it is a fact that at neither of these installations was a single question put to the candidate,—for it will scarcely be urged that his being asked if he accepted the call is to be understood as one in any disputed sense.*

Absolute non-interrogation, then, is the great principle of the Presbytery of Antrim, unchanged for 136 years, and which it is the boast of its present leaders that they have always consistently maintained. Is it indeed? Well, we shall see.

* Since the above was written, our anticipations have been verified as to the real intentions of the Presbytery of Antrim, and the course likely to be pursued by them, by their ordaining Mr. W. J. Smyth as minister to the seceding party in Carrickfergus, without, as far as we can learn, a single question of any kind having been put by them on the occasion. Truly, the absolute non-interrogation system gains courage as it advances. It is well to have it thus fully manifested, that the Christian laity of Ulster may see what spirit these men are of.

We have now come at length to our "Gleaning" number two, from the *Bible Christian* of October, 1839. Vol. i., Third Series, p. 312):—

"ORDINATION AT BALLYCLARE.—On Thursday, the 5th September, the Presbytery of Antrim met at *Ballyclare*, to ordain the Rev. John Hall, as assistant minister of the Presbyterian Congregation in that place. The day was favourable, and the meeting-house was filled by a most respectable and attentive audience. The sermon was preached by the Rev. C. J. M'Alester; the *Rev. S. C. Nelson* then, in a lucid and interesting address,—explained Presbyterian ordination, after which the young minister, *having answered the usual questions (proh pudor!)* was set apart to the office of the ministry by the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery, the Rev. W. Bruce offering up the ordination prayer. The minister and congregation were then addressed by the Rev. J. Carley, who gave a most impressive charge, pointing out the various duties that devolved upon them, and the particular privileges which, as liberal Presbyterians, they enjoyed. The services were throughout most solemn and appropriate, and were calculated to make a lasting impression on all who were present."

A very lasting impression truly! We make no further comment on this report. Words of ours would only dim its lustre. C.

LICENSING OF CANDIDATES IN THE REMONSTRANT SYNOD BEFORE THE ADOPTION OF THE NEW CODE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CHRISTIAN UNITARIAN.

DEAR SIR,—The violent outcry that has been raised in some of our churches against any questions of a religious kind being asked by our Presbyteries of candidates either for license or ordination, appears to me not merely uncalled for, but also unwise and mischievous. If carried out, it would make our Presbyteries mere *ciphers* in the government of our churches—it would put a gag in our mouths on every question touching the *Christian* belief of those whom we admit to the sacred office as *ministers* in the ministry of the Gospel—it would make the will of the laity unquestioned and absolute in all cases—it would undermine Presbyterianism in our churches, and establish independency on its ruins. Now, as a Presbyterian in principle, and as a member of the Remonstrant Synod, I, for one, am not prepared to accept these results. On the contrary, I find myself impetuously called on to resist them, and to uphold the rights of Presbyteries, as well as stand up for the liberties of the people. I took an active part in preparing and passing the present Code of Discipline for the regulation of our churches, and feel bound to maintain its principles as liberal, comprehensive, salutary, and *Christian*. Not long before that Code was prepared or adopted, I acted on its principles in the licensing of candidates almost to the letter, as the

following statement of facts, which I think important at the present time, will shew.

In the year 1849, Mr. Robert Harris, the son of a respected elder of my congregation, and who had been a very promising and successful student, under the care of the Armagh Presbytery, presented himself for license at our stated meeting in Dromore, in the autumn of that year, and during the ministry of the Rev. W. B. Minniss. It was intimated to me some time previously, that the duty of setting him apart to the office of the ministry would devolve on me, and I accordingly prepared a form of license which I used on the occasion, and which I take the liberty of subjoining. It was spoken in the presence of a full meeting of Presbytery, and the members afterwards expressed their approbation of it in warm terms. It will clearly appear from it how fully the *Christian* requirements of our present Code were then acted on by me, without a cavil, and with the full satisfaction and approbation of the Presbytery.—Yours truly,

WILLIAM CROZIER.

January 19, 1863.

FORM OF LICENSE.

"MR. HARRIS,—The Presbytery of Armagh having received you as a student under their care, having sedulously watched over the course of your studies, having approved of all your examinations and sustained all your discourses, and being fully satisfied of your diligence, proficiency, and moral correctness, have now appointed me to set you apart to the important, truly honourable, and sacred office of a preacher of the Gospel. Before I do so, allow me to ascertain from you, for the satisfaction of the Presbytery, the following particulars touching your belief as a Christian. Do you believe in One God, the Father, the Creator, and governor of the world, the fountain of all perfection, and the object of all divine worship? Do you believe the Scriptures to contain an inspired revelation from God, and to be the only authorized rule of a Christian's faith and practice? Do you believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, and appointed Saviour of the world? Do you believe in a judgment to come, and in a future state of rewards and punishments?"

"Having received your solemn assent to these fundamental truths of religion, I leave your understanding free to follow the convictions of sincerity and truth in all other matters pertaining to godliness, and have only farther to ask you, Do you promise to study and endeavour to promote the peace, unity, and prosperity of the Christian Church? And do you promise to submit yourself, in the Lord, to the government and discipline of this Presbytery?"

THE LATE REV. F. BLAKELY AND DR. MONTGOMERY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CHRISTIAN UNITARIAN.

SIR—As an inmate of Mr. Blakely's house for nearly seven years previous to his removal to England, as one engaged in reading to him daily, when his own eyes no longer availed him for the pur-

pose, and who, at his daughter's request, had undertaken the duty of looking after his domestic affairs, and who, therefore, may be supposed to know whether his house "became a rendezvous" for Dr. Montgomery's detractors, I beg to claim the insertion of a few lines in your next number in reply to the very unwarrantable and unchristian attack contained in your last on the memory of my old friend and pastor.

Of course, with the question in dispute between the Doctor and his opponents in the Remonstrant Synod, with which the first part of his letter is occupied, I have nothing to do; nor am I able to see what it had to do with the simple statement of a fact alleged in the pages of the *Non-Subscriber*, namely, that Mr. Blakely had caused a request to be conveyed to Dr. Montgomery that he would visit him before he left the country, and that he did not comply with that request. Much less do I know anything, having never heard of any private pecuniary transactions between my old friend and Dr. Montgomery. If they existed, I have no doubt they were discharged honourably, as, indeed, it appears from the Doctor's letter, save some *supposed* claim of £100 interest on the loans, which it does not appear he had ever asked for during my friend's life, from all of which it appears he had legally released him in 1836, though he now makes this new claim after his decease. The whole statement seems, to my weak judgment, such a violation of the sanctities of private friendship—so totally foreign to the charge in question—and so ungenerous in itself, that I cannot reconcile it with that conduct which becomes a *gentleman*—we shall leave Christianity out of the question—much less with the Doctor's statement—"Nothing shall induce me to say an ungenerous word of one of the purest-minded and kindest-hearted men that ever lived!"

But when the Doctor proceeds to make statements as to Mr. Blakely's mind, temper, and habit, and what occurred in his house at this period of his life.—on this subject I must esteem myself a witness; and as my old friend's lips are sealed for ever in this world, I deem it only my *duty*—however painful to me to appear in this controversy—to bear this my humble and unsought for testimony.

The Doctor asserts that a "man naturally amiable, unselfish, honourable, and worthy," was "reduced in his old age, by bodily and *mental* infirmity, to be a mere instrument in the hands of unscrupulous men, for effecting purposes which, in the vigour of life, his manly spirit would have spurned." The statement here is that of *mental* imbecility on the part of Mr. B., a statement which every one that conversed with him up to the latest period of his residence in this country, must know, as I do, to be unfounded. Indeed it was the usual remark of visitors, that, however weak in body—and very infirm he was—his mental faculties, even to their surprise, continued in all respects unimpaired; so that he was not likely to become "a mere instrument in the hands of unscrupulous men," or to be "cajoled, duped, and blinded."

Of his alleged "almost single failing, *vanity*," I shall only say that, when Dr. Montgomery manifests the humility that becomes a Christian, and makes less use of the *personal pronoun* I, it will be

time enough to consider who has been the more observant, in this respect, of the precepts of the Great Master.

It is asserted (p. 434), that "his declining faculties were rendered morbid and irritable," by the device of "the unscrupulous men" above referred to, whoever these may be, an assertion that I beg most distinctly to contradict. That a certain degree of irritability is always the result of long bodily infirmity, I admit; and to this in some degree, as his end approached, my friend was subject, as who that is human would not? But that his mind was rendered "morbid" by any such "device" is totally unfounded. And, on the whole, his temper was most patient, resigned, and Christian, under his long affliction.

As to the next statement, that he (Mr. B.) "began to rail against me (Dr. M.) as if I had been his deadliest foe," this I believe to be *totally unfounded*. That Mr. B. has spoken, in my hearing, with deep regret of Dr. M.'s present line of conduct, dividing as it does the Church, and setting brother against brother, I admit. That he ever railed against him as his foe, or attributed even unworthy motives, however mistaken he might think him, I do not believe.

It is next asserted.—"His house, of course, became the rendezvous of all the young aspirants who forgot my services, or meanly envied my position in the Church and in the world." With respect to this, I must assert that Mr. B.'s house was ever hospitably open to the *friends* as well as the opponents of the Doctor, and that the most impartial man in the company was usually Mr. B. himself; but whether "the young aspirants" in the Remonstrant Synod were those who "forgot the Doctor's services," or those who hoped to benefit by his influence, I do not take upon me to say.

With respect to the scene referred to by the Doctor when his (Mr. B.'s) "favourite elder rose and called upon his wife to go home," I shall say nothing. Engaged as I was in attending to the guests, I took but little note of what was passing. But when the Doctor goes on in the next paragraph to assert—"The virtual derangement of his moral faculties . . . soon afterwards culminated in his passing me unsaluted, and with a scowl of indignation, on the streets of Belfast; and sadder still, his own son, David, . . . followed his deluded father's unhappy example," I must beg to say that the Doctor's memory must have played him false, or his imagination rather have supplied these facts! *After* the scene referred to, my firm conviction is, that Mr. B. never was in Belfast, until he passed through on his way to England, when the Doctor admits he did not see him. And his inability to walk, for years previously, renders it impossible that he could have passed him "with a scowl of indignation on the streets." And as to his son David, he had actually died before I went to sleep with Mr. B. at all; so that the whole of this statement seems to me a fiction of the Doctor's fertile imagination.

As to the other "deeply affecting scene" recorded in page 435, this must, I presume, have taken place in his bed-chamber, or when I was not present, as I do not remember it. I can only hope that the Doctor has not embellished this also. That he was sent for on two occasions, according to his own statement, by his old

friend, on the latter of which he admits he did *not* come, shows the desire of my late venerated pastor to act on the Christian precept to be "reconciled to his brother." That on another occasion he visited Moneyrea, when invited by the Young Men's Society, I am aware, when the Doctor did *not* call to visit his old friend, as the latter expected, and when he did not even ask for him, though very infirm at the time, though he shook hands on that occasion with myself—a fact which I concealed from Mr. B., as I knew it would wound his feelings.

What other arrows the Doctor has in his "quiver" I know not; or what aspersions wherewith to try to blacken the memory of his departed brother. Though I presume not to contend with Dr. M., especially in powers of vituperative language, I do not ask in this plain statement for that "mockness and forbearance" which in his zeal for Christianity he so resolutely "scorns." I only know that my old pastor had not so learned Christ; that, while most honest and upright, as his whole life can witness, he was both forbearing and forgiving towards his opponents; and that above and before all, he would have scorned to betray private confidences, and to asperse the character even of an enemy when dead, much less of one who once was his dearest friend.

MARY ANN M'KITTRICK.

CLONMEL, 12th January, 1863.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CHRISTIAN UNITARIAN.

SIR,—My attention has been directed to the January number of the *Christian Unitarian*, containing a letter from Dr. Montgomery, in which charges are preferred against the character and memory of my father-in-law, the late Rev. F. Blakely, of Moneyrea. Among other things, Dr. Montgomery represents Mr. Blakely as being *untruthful and dishonest, ungrateful and hypocritical, with mental faculties so impaired* that he easily became the dupe of unscrupulous men, and with *moral faculties so deranged* that he was incapable of judging between right and wrong. At present, I content myself with a distinct and unqualified denial of *all these charges*. More unfounded calumnies were never put into circulation. And I should at once proceed to prove them such, had not Dr. Montgomery asserted Mr. Blakely's indebtedness to him, the only matter about which there is any doubt. When this difficulty shall have been removed, I shall then show that Dr. Montgomery has been *unjust* to the memory, and has *slandered* the character of his early and life-long friend. But, as the question of indebtedness is about to undergo the scrutiny of a competent and impartial judge, it is better, perhaps, to postpone the consideration of Dr. Montgomery's *post mortem* indictment, as a whole, till the investigation of the accounts has been made.

I have only to add, that although no legal claim of indebtedness exists, as Dr. Montgomery acknowledges, still, if he can establish an equitable claim, his account shall be paid.—Very truly yours,

WILLIAM COCHRANE.

INTELLIGENCE.

ORDINATION AT CARRICKFERGUS.

ON Monday, December 29, the Rev. Robert Cleland was ordained to the pastoral charge of the Remonstrant Congregation of Carrickfergus. From causes mentioned in our January number, the meeting-house was closed against the members of the Remonstrant Synod, but the use of an adjoining meeting-house belonging to members of the General Assembly was kindly given for the occasion. The introductory services were conducted by the Rev. W. Crozier (Rademon), who preached an able and appropriate sermon from John vi. 68,—“Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life.” The Rev. Joseph M’Fadden, Moderator of the Body, explained, in a simple and lucid manner, the Presbyterian form of ordination.

The Rev. Dr. MONTGOMERY conducted the ordination service. He said—As the oldest minister of the Remonstrant Synod of Ulster, or of the Non-Subscribing Churches in the North of Ireland, I have been appointed to take a very solemn part in the interesting duties of this day—namely, the special work of ordaining a young minister whom this congregation has chosen to be its stated pastor. We are, I believe, in the truest sense of the word, a free Church—that is to say, we are free from all human authority in matters of faith. We call no man on earth Rabbi, for one is our Master, even Christ, and we all are brethren. But, at the same time, whilst we are a free Church, we are also a Christian Church. Whilst we acknowledge no man master, we do acknowledge the headship of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, who is the foundation stone of the Gospel dispensation. We are, therefore, the friends of liberty—a liberty within, not beyond, the pale of the Christian Church. No man is entitled to be called a Christian who goes beyond the pale of Christianity, however respectable he may be as a Deist, as an Atheist, as a Jew, or as a Mahommedan, and we do not deny that there may be men holding these erroneous views who are highly respectable. While we are a free Christian Church, we have established rules for our guidance in the ordination of young men, which trench in no way on the perfect freedom of the people, or of the pastor chosen. All we ask subscription to is the Divine authority of the Christian dispensation. More than that we have no right to ask, because we would be trenching on the sacred ground of conscience; but less than that we feel we ought not to ask, because we would then be deserting the standard of the cross. We would then cease to be the disciples of Jesus, and would give up our Christian profession and name. In accordance with these principles, we feel bound, at the ordination of young ministers in our Church, to ask three simple questions, involving no special doctrine of any Church—questions which might be answered by Trinitarian, Humanitarian, or Arian; they might be answered by Calvinist or Arminian, by those belonging to any of the hundred sects or denominations that prevail in Christendom.

The questions, therefore, in no degree partake of the character of a human creed. Consequently, we feel we are not trespassing on conscience when we ask the profession of this faith from the candidate for the ministry. We are a Christian Church, and we will receive no person into our Church that is not professedly a Christian, in some shape or form. In accordance with the grounds I have stated, and with the code of discipline of our Church, I now ask Mr. Cleland questions which can be answered by any man who professes to be a Christian—"Do you believe in one God, the Creator and Governor of the universe?"

MR. CLELAND—I do.

DR. MONTGOMERY—"Do you believe the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament to contain a Divine Revelation?"

MR. CLELAND—I do.

DR. MONTGOMERY—"Do you believe in the Divine mission and authority of the Lord Jesus Christ as the Son of God and Saviour of the world?"

MR. CLELAND—I do.

DR. MONTGOMERY—These are the three questions embracing an acknowledgment of Christianity. You are now at liberty to make any statement you please to the congregation, if you choose to do so.

MR. CLELAND then made a lengthened statement of his religious views, after which he was set apart to the work of the ministry by the laying on of hands.

DR. MONTGOMERY delivered an impressive charge to the minister and people, and the proceedings closed with prayer.

We shall publish in next number, Mr. Cleland's statement of belief, and an outline of the proceedings at the entertainment given in the evening to the ministers attending the ordination.

PRESENTATION TO THE REV. WILLIAM BRUCE.

At the close of Divine service, on Christmas Day, a meeting of the members of the First Congregation, Belfast, was held in the meeting-house, for the purpose of presenting to their senior pastor, the Rev. W. Bruce, a volume containing the address, with the autograph signatures of the members, presented to him on March 2nd. and also some articles of plate, in order that his family might possess tokens of that love and respect for him which had been publicly testified by the erection of the ornamental windows in the church. The Rev. J. Scott Porter presided. W. J. C. Allen, Esq., in the name of the congregation, made the presentation, and the Chairman, in expressing the sentiments which animated the congregation, said that "neither words spoken nor illuminated parchment, neither ornamented glass nor sculptured silver, could adequately convey their feelings of veneration and love." Mr. Bruce replied in feeling terms, and concluded by the expression of his earnest wish "that that Heavenly grace, which, as it were, on that day was first opened to the world, might be manifested in all its richness in their hearts and lives." On the motion of J. M. Darbishire, Esq., seconded by Robert Patterson, Esq., the second chair was taken by John Riddell, Esq., and a cordial vote of thanks passed to the chairman.

CONGREGATIONAL SOIREE AT COMBER.

A social meeting of the members and friends of the Remonstrant congregation of Comber was held on the evening of December 31. The meeting-house was tastefully decorated with evergreens. On the wall, opposite the pulpit, the appropriate motto, "God is Love," was exhibited in large characters, surrounded with a wreath of flowers and evergreens, and over it was a well-executed representation of an open Bible. After tea, the chair was taken by John Miller, Esq., one of the founders of the congregation, and one of its most liberal and consistent supporters. Short addresses were given by the Rev. John Orr (the pastor of the congregation), John M'Caw, W. O. M'Gowan, C. J. M'Alester, John Andrews, Esq., J.P., Dr. Young, and James Andrews, Esq., on the following subjects:—"A Retrospect of the Year," "Sunday Schools," "National Education," "Christian Forbearance," "Our English Brethren," "Our Friends of other Denominations," &c. Various pieces of sacred music were sung by the choir, and added greatly to the enjoyment of the meeting. At an earlier hour, the children of the Sunday-school had been entertained at tea, and premiums had been distributed to the most deserving.

DOMESTIC MISSION, BELFAST.

On Tuesday evening, December 23rd, the children and adults connected with this institution were entertained at tea in the spacious school-rooms of the mission-house. A number of ladies and gentlemen, supporters of the mission, were present. After tea, the Rev. T. Bowring took the chair, and the evening was agreeably diversified by brief addresses from the chairman, the Rev. J. S. Porter, and C. J. M'Alester, by the singing of various hymns, and the exhibition of a magic lantern, with explanatory remarks, by Robert Patterson, Esq. The lantern was kindly lent for the occasion by Dr. Ritchie. The attendance was extremely large, and the meeting in every respect most gratifying.

OBITUARY.

Died, at Ballystockart, near Comber, on January 6, Miss Martha Davidson, aged 82 years.

Died, in London, on January 14, Hugh Crawford Smith, Esq., Liverpool, and Inver Lodge, Larne.

Died, at her residence, The Croft, Holywood, on January 18, Mary, fourth daughter of the late Mr. Robert Ker, Katesbridge, County Down.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

Various articles of intelligence in type, held over for want of space.

Communications for the Editor, to be addressed by post to Rev. C. J. M'Alester, Holywood; or, otherwise, to 45, Arthur Street, Belfast.

Orders for the work and business communications to be sent to the Agent of the Unitarian Society, 45, Arthur Street.

THE
CHRISTIAN UNITARIAN.

VOL. II.]

MARCH, 1863.

[No. 2.]

COLENSO ON THE PENTATEUCH.

(Continued from page 14.)

THE main argument against the early date commonly assigned to the Pentateuch is drawn from the enormous numbers which its author attributes to the people of Israel at the time of their departure from Egypt. His data would imply a population of *at least two millions*; and no one can believe, or, we suppose, does believe, that a nation so numerous could have sprung, without a miracle—(*which is not alleged*)—from fifty-five men and their wives, in two generations. Neither Moses nor any contemporary writer would have ventured upon such a statement. It must have originated at a time when all exact memory of the facts had been lost; and when no one thought of applying to the narrative the principles of statistics drawn from history and experience. From this primary error many other inconsistencies and contradictions flow, which would themselves have been enough to stamp upon the work in which they are found the character of an inexact and comparatively recent composition. We shall briefly enumerate the particulars of this kind on which Dr. Colenso relies in proof of his main position.

We must, however, repeat a remark which we had occasion to make in our former notice of the Bishop's work. He is far too anxious to heap up arguments on his own side of the question, and has thus been led to employ several which are weak, and some which are unsound. We shall, in the first place, dispose of those reasonings of the learned prelate which we regard as inconclusive or erroneous.

He has made a great difficulty of the fact which he supposes to be asserted in the twelfth chapter of Exodus,

that "*in one single day* the whole immense population of Israel, as large as that of London, was instructed to keep the passover, and actually did keep it. I have said *in one single day*; for the first notice of any such feast to be kept is given in verse 3 of this very chapter; and we find it written in verse 12—'I will pass through the land of Egypt *this night*, and will smite all the first-born in the land of Egypt, both man and beast.'" (P. 54.) We admit that the communication of the minute regulations for the observance of the passover, to such a body of people, so scattered as they must have been—in the course of twelve hours—with such accuracy that not a single house was overlooked, would have been a moral, if not a physical, impossibility. But it seems to us that Dr. Colenso here reasons on a mistaken rendering of our common version. We agree with him that "the story as it now stands," [i.e., *in our translation of the Bible*,] "with the directions about taking the lamb on the *tenth* day and keeping it till the *fourteenth*, are [*is*] perplexing and contradictory." (P. 55.) But common justice requires that we are not *needlessly* to translate the author so as to make him contradict himself; and the whole perplexity is removed by rendering the first verse of the chapter—"Now, Jehovah *had spoken* unto Moses and Aaron in the land of Egypt," &c., instead of "And the LORD *spake*," &c.; a rendering which is just as literal as the common one, and which the translators have themselves adopted in several passages.* If this rendering be adopted the only difficulty that remains is the use of the pronoun "*this*" instead of "*that*," in verse 12; an inaccuracy which might easily be allowed for in the style of an author far more attentive to grammatical niceties than the writer of these books. The whole context seems to intimate that notice of the passover was given *early* in the month; that on the *tenth* day of the month the lambs were selected; and that on the *fourteenth* they were killed and eaten. There was, therefore, ample warning, and plenty of time for preparation.

And the same considerations show how unfounded is

* See Gen. xii. 1; xxiv. 65; Exod. xxxii. 29; xxxiii. 5; 1 Kings xxi. 4; Isaiah xxxviii. 21, 22. The *Revised Translation* renders in this manner Exod. xi. 1.

the Bishop's assertion that the whole of the mighty host of Israel, "about six hundred thousand on foot that were men, besides children, and also a mixed multitude, with flocks, and herds, and very much cattle," (Exod. xii. 37, 38) were "summoned to start *at a moment's notice*," like Dr. Colenso's own family when once it was roused from its sleep, "and obliged to fly at dead of night," to escape the threatened inroad of a band of Zulus. (*Colenso*, pp. 61—64.) Every one must see that no such movement could possibly have taken place under the circumstances supposed by Dr. Colenso. But the difficulty is of his own making. There is not a word in the history about the Israelites being "*suddenly called on to set out*," or about them "*starting at a moment's notice*." On the contrary, if our criticism on the rendering of Exod. xii. 1 be admitted—and we believe it to be sound—they had received almost, if not quite, a fortnight's notice; for, under the circumstances related in the preceding nine chapters, notice of the passover was warning to be ready for instant flight. No doubt, the warning would be extremely short; but still it constitutes the difference between a great difficulty and an utter impossibility.

Again. The Bishop finds an objection to the historical character of the Pentateuch, on the statement in Exod. xiii. 18, that "the children of Israel went up *harnessed*," (*i.e.*, armed), "out of the land of Egypt." He relies very strongly on the word here translated "*harnessed*;" he calls it "*a stubborn word*," and intimates that as long as it remains in the text the narrative is inconsistent with itself. (*Colenso*, pp. 51—53.) For how, he asks, could the 600,000 have got arms? Would their Egyptian oppressors have permitted an armed force of that amount to exist among them? Had they possessed weapons, would they have tamely submitted to the treatment which they experienced at the hand of the tyrant? Or would six hundred thousand armed men have cried out with terror when they saw that they were pursued? (Exod. xiv. 10.) But, unfortunately for this reasoning, there are few words in the Hebrew language the meaning of which is more uncertain than is that of the word here rendered "*harnessed*." King James's translators were quite unable to fix its signification to their own satisfac-

tion; hence they have put "*harnessed*" in the text, but have placed in the margin, "*by five in a rank*," as an alternative rendering. Others explain it as denoting that they were divided into troops of fifty, or battalions of five hundred.* Any of these significations will suit the sense, not only here, but in every other place where the word occurs. Besides, there is no difficulty in supposing that the Israelites, on their retreat from Rameses, might have seized on such agricultural and other implements as were within their reach, and converted them into weapons for the occasion. *Furor aliquando arma ministrat.*

Next in this category we place the Bishop's criticisms "on the size of the court of the Tabernacle, compared with the number of the congregation." (*Colenso*, pp. 31—34.) We read in Levit. viii. 1, 4, that "the LORD spake unto Moses saying, 'Gather thou all the congregation together unto the door of the Tabernacle of the congregation.' And Moses did as the LORD commanded him; and the assembly was gathered together unto the door of the Tabernacle of the congregation." The Bishop holds that as the assembly was to be convened at the door of the Tabernacle it must have been within the court. But the Tabernacle itself was only ten cubits, or about eighteen feet broad; not more than nine men in a row could have stood in front of it: and allowing eighteen inches in depth for each rank, the 600,000 men of Israel—supposing the old men, the women and the children to have staid at home—would have formed a column of nearly twenty miles long. Of course not more than the hundredth part of such a multitude could have even seen the solemnity which they were summoned to witness. But the whole court, all round the Tabernacle, if densely crowded, would not have held more than 5,000 people. How then could such a vast multitude find accommodation in that part of it merely which was in front of the Tabernacle?

We regard this as solemn trifling. A convention held

* These interpretations are founded on the derivation of the word *hhamushim*, from the Hebrew word *hhamesh*, "five." Gesenius derives it from a verb not found in Hebrew, but which occurs in Arabic, *hhamisha*, signifying "to be brave and strenuous in war;" but the context will not admit that sense in Exod. xiii. 18.

for the purpose indicated at the front entrance to the court of the Tabernacle—the boards of which might easily be removed for the occasion—might with perfect correctness be said to have met “at the door of the Tabernacle of the congregation.” There the space would have sufficed to allow four or five hundred to stand in a row. And nothing is more common than to regard as a general meeting of an entire body of men, an assemblage to which all are summoned, although not one in ten, or one in a hundred, of those who are entitled to be present, may actually appear. We remember when “*Aggregate Meetings of the Catholics of Ireland*” were convened, from time to time, and held within the walls of a chapel in the city of Dublin. Does any one suppose that there is a building in the world that would contain six millions of people?

With the same remark we dismiss another of Dr. Colenso’s objections (*Colenso*, pp. 35, 37), built on the fact of Moses having delivered an address to “all Israel.” (Deut. i. 1; v. 1.) “Surely,” he says, “no human voice, unless strengthened by a miracle, of which the Scripture tells us nothing, could have reached the ears of a crowded mass of people as large as the whole population of London.” (P. 37.) Did the Bishop never hear of a man addressing a “County meeting,” say of Yorkshire or Lancashire, each with its more than a million of inhabitants? Such criticisms are captious, and are unworthy of a right-minded scholar, whose only object is to discover truth, not to bolster up, or beat down, any opinion or any cause.

Bishop Colenso, in the first edition of his book, brought forward as glaring inconsistencies two regulations which he seems to have greatly misunderstood; and, indeed, he so modifies his observations upon them by “corrections and additions” in later reprints, that they amount to nothing. He first argues, with needless detail, that a camp for two or three millions of people must have contained at least as much space as is covered by the city and suburbs of London; say twelve square miles, or an area of four miles in length and three in breadth. In the centre of the camp was situated the Tabernacle where alone the victims that were offered in sacrifice could be

slain. Now, in the case of a bullock slain as a sacerdotal sin-offering, it was directed that the priest "should carry forth without the camp" the skin of the victim, "and all his flesh, with his head, and with his legs, and his inwards, and his dung, *even the whole bullock*, to a clear place, where the ashes are poured out; and there burn him with fire." (Lev. iv. 11, 12.) This, as the Bishop thinks, would have required the priest to carry a whole bullock *on his back* for the distance of a mile and a-half; or, at the very lowest calculation, three-quarters of a mile. (Colenso, pp. 38—40.) But here again his lordship argues from the version, without consulting the original. There is nothing in the text about the priest carrying such a load "*on his back*;" in fact, nothing about *carrying it at all*; for the word literally signifies "*shall cause to go forth*," and might as well be rendered, "*shall send forth*." The Doctor makes a similar difficulty with reference to a sanitary regulation enjoined in Deut. xxiii. 12—14; but on this it is needless to dwell, as the 9th verse distinctly shews that the rule was made not for the great encampment of the Israelites, but solely for an "host going forth against the enemy." And we may observe, that a similar regulation is strictly enforced in all the encampments of the British army, and, we believe, of every other European army, when it takes the field.

But, although the Right Rev. Prelate makes a number of objections, in the force of which we cannot concur, there are some of his arguments which we see no means of fairly turning aside, and the force of which we feel ourselves constrained to allow.

One of these is built upon the small number of the priests during the sojourn in the wilderness, compared with the multiplicity of their duties. (Colenso, pp. 122—130.)

After the giving of the law, Aaron and his sons alone were privileged to exercise any of the functions pertaining to the priesthood. Any person, not of Aaron's posterity, who presumed to perform any sacerdotal duty, was to be put to death. (Num. iii. 10, 38.) How many priests were there then? Only *three*: Aaron (till his death), and his two sons, Eleazar and Ithamar. Aaron had had two other sons—Nadab and Abihu—but they had "died before the Lord, when they offered strange fire before

the Lord, in the wilderness of Sinai; and they had no children; and Eleazar and Ithamar ministered in the priest's office, in the sight of Aaron their father." (Num. iii. 4.) Thus there were only three priests for the whole duty of the sanctuary. And it was very heavy. Every morning and every evening a lamb was to be offered up for a burnt-offering: on the Sabbath, the new moon, the feast of unleavened bread, and the feast of first-fruits, additional sacrifices were to be presented. Besides this, burnt-offerings were expected from the people, as voluntary oblations, from time to time. (Lev. i. 2, 3.) In every case of a burnt-offering being presented, the officiating priest was to bring the blood and sprinkle it round about upon the altar, and to flay the victim, and cut it in pieces, and put fire upon the altar, and lay wood upon the fire, and lay the parts, the head, and the fat, in order upon the wood, and wash the inwards and the legs with water, and burn all upon the altar. (Lev. i. 5—9.) Similar duties were enjoined in reference to the peace-offering, the sin-offering, and the trespass-offering, and even the passover. Were, then, the occasions rare on which these sacrifices were to be presented? On the contrary, they were excessively numerous. Every person who was cured of leprosy had to present a burnt-offering and a sin-offering. Every woman after child-birth had to offer a lamb for a burnt-offering, and a pigeon or a turtle-dove for a sin-offering; or else two young pigeons for the two offerings. Every person who had accomplished a vow, or had experienced any signal blessing from God, was to express his thankfulness by presenting a peace-offering. Every one who had sinned, through ignorance, against any of the prohibitory precepts of the law, had to offer a sin-offering. Every one who had incurred uncleanness by violating some of the ceremonial statutes, or who had transgressed any of the ordinances laid down for the "holy things of the Lord," were required to present a trespass-offering. There were certain other offences, partly ritual, partly moral, for which peculiar sacrifices were enjoined. Lastly, *no animal whatever was permitted to be slain for food that had not first been brought to the door of the Tabernacle and offered as a peace-offering.* "What man soever there be of the house of

Israel that killeth an ox, or a lamb, or a goat, *in the camp*, or that killeth it *out of the camp*, and bringeth it not unto the door of the Tabernacle of the congregation, to offer an offering unto the LORD before the door of the Tabernacle of the LORD, blood shall be imputed unto that man, . . . and that man shall be cut off from among his people.” (Lev. xvii. 3, 4.) If it be considered that the Israelites amounted to two millions, or two millions and a-half, at this time, it is evident that the three priests who had to officiate at all these sacrifices had no sinecure. They must have been toiling from sunrise to sunset every day in the year, under the broiling sun of Arabia; and, after all, it seems inconceivable how they could have got through one-tenth of their work. The births alone in such a population must have required the presentation of upwards of 250 burnt-offerings, and as many sin-offerings, every day.

But, on the other hand, their perquisites were also large. With every victim that was sacrificed of whatever kind, a “meat-offering” was to be presented. This was a dish of flour, oil, and salt, baked in an oven, or in a pan. A small portion was to be burnt upon the altar; the remainder was to be the perquisite of the priest: and was to be eaten in the holy place. In addition to this the right shoulder and the whole breast of the peace-offering, together with *the whole flesh of the sin-offering and the trespass-offering* were to be theirs. Moreover, the first-born of every clean animal, if a male, was to be sacrificed; its blood was to be poured out upon the altar; its fat to be consumed with fire; the remainder of its flesh was to be the perquisite of the priest. The quantity of flesh-meat and other provisions thus placed at the disposal of Aaron and his two sons must have been very great. From the child-birth sin-offerings alone, upwards of 250 pigeons or turtle-doves must have fallen to their lot every day in the year! From other sources,—peace-offerings, sin-offerings, trespass-offerings and sacrifices of the first-born animals,—their revenue must have been fully four times as much more; and besides there were the meat-offerings. The difficulty in this case arises from the fact that all this enormous quantity of provisions was not to be sold, nor given away, nor shared with any one else, nor even burnt with fire. *It was all to be eaten by Aaron and his two sons,*

assisted in some cases by their wives and children. The pigeons alone would average eighty-eight per diem for each priest; all to be eaten in the holy place! not one to be given away; not one to be destroyed! It is manifest that the person who wrote this portion of the history had never taken the trouble to reflect how the laws which he was writing down corresponded with the account he had given of the vast population of the children of Israel. No one, in fact, who had thought for a moment on what he was saying, could have promulgated a law which *absolutely required* the sacrifice of 90,000 pigeons or turtle-doves every year, and that in the stony desert of Arabia, where no such creature is to be found, and where, if imported, it could not find sustenance.

And this leads us to consider the means of subsistence afforded by the desert through which the Israelites wandered for forty years, for the flocks and herds by which they were accompanied. (See *Colenso*, pp. 65—81.)

The Israelites, when they settled in Egypt, were a pastoral people; shepherds and herdsmen. That they continued to be so till the time of their departure, the narrative in the Pentateuch seems to assume; but it would not be safe to build an argument on the silence of the historian. However, the author distinctly states that the children of Israel observed the feast of the passover on the night before their departure. This required a lamb to be slain in each household: and, allowing that one lamb sufficed for every fifteen individuals, on that one night alone upwards of 133,000 lambs must have been killed; and these were all males, and all of the first year. It is not probable that the whole of the male lambs of that year would be killed for that single solemnity; we may therefore suppose that the whole of the male lambs amounted to 200,000; and as the females would probably be as numerous, the total increase of the flock during that year would be not fewer than 400,000 lambs. This would imply a flock of at least 2,000,000. That they had also oxen, we are expressly informed, for they had no other beasts of burden to carry their tents, furniture, and baggage across the desert: but no data are given from which their numbers can be calculated.

There were, however, 2,000,000, probably far more

than 2,000,000 of sheep and lambs; and with these they set out on their march from the bank of the Nile towards the Red Sea. During the latter part of that journey pasturage must have been very scarce; the travellers who have crossed the desert from Cairo to Suez, which is nearly the same route that was followed by the Israelites, describe it as a region of sand and gravel, varied occasionally by the out-cropping of the hard rock, without a stream of water, (rain scarcely ever falls in that climate), without a blade of vegetation, except, at long intervals, a stunted shrub or two, on which a camel, if very hungry, will stop to nibble a few of the parched and bitter leaves. We will suppose, however, that the Israelites brought with them from the Nile, or the canals near its banks, as much water as sufficed for themselves and their flocks till they arrived at the shores of the Red Sea. They then crossed its bed, an operation which could not occupy, for a host so encumbered as theirs, less than a day. By this time their flocks, to say nothing of themselves and their little ones, must have been suffering severely from drought. However, there was no retreating now; so "they went out into the wilderness of Shur; and they went three days into the wilderness, *and found no water.*" (Exod. xv. 22.) It is unnecessary to say that, finding no water, they could find no *pasture*; for the only spots in that dry and barren peninsula where any sign of vegetation is to be found are the places, few and far between, where a scanty spring shews itself for a few perches above the ground, to be speedily swallowed again and drunk up by the thirsty sand. Two millions of human beings, with their beasts of burden, accompanied by as many sheep and lambs, marching for four successive days without a blade of grass or pasture of any kind for the flocks, or a drop of water to cool the parched mouths of men and beasts, must have suffered prodigiously; in fact, none but the very strongest constitutions could pass through such an ordeal. The sick, the aged, and the young, must have perished in tens of thousands and hundreds of thousands. But we read of no such calamity. The Israelites occasionally murmured under their hardships; but not one is represented as having sunk under them. Strange to say, even their cattle survived

this horrid march uninjured ; for, at the end of the first twelve months after the exodus, they celebrated their second passover under Mount Sinai, a solemnity which, like the first, required—as did also every subsequent one of the forty which they celebrated in the wilderness—the sacrifice of 133,000 male lambs of the first year ; and that, as we have seen, implies the continued possession of flocks consisting of millions. Now, the nature of the peninsula of Horeb, in which they were encamped for the first twelve months after their departure from Egypt, and of the Arabian desert, in which they wandered subsequently, is well known. It might be possible for a small tribe of people, living as the Bedouins live at present, and possessing, as they do, small flocks of goats and camels, (the Israelites had no camels), to maintain a wretched and precarious existence, by searching out the rare spots where an appearance of vegetation is to be found, in the neighbourhood of the scanty springs which exist among the barren rocks and scorching sands, like small islands in the wide waste of wilderness ; and by dispersing themselves and their flocks among these *oases*—five here, ten there, a dozen or so elsewhere—as each might be able to afford sustenance for its occupants. But that millions of sheep and lambs, together with large herds of black cattle, could possibly live in that savage region, especially that they could live if collected together in the neighbourhood of one vast encampment, is incredible. Nature herself interposes a veto. Neither are we at liberty to suppose that the soil or climate of the desert has changed since the days when the children of Israel wandered over it after their flight from Egypt. It is described in the Pentateuch itself in terms which shew that its physical characteristics have undergone no change. It was then as it is now, “a desert land, a waste and howling wilderness,” (Deut. xxxii. 10). It was then, as it is to this day, “a great and terrible wilderness, wherein were fiery serpents, and scorpions, and drought, wherein there was no water,” (Deut. viii. 15). It was then, as it is still, “an evil place : no place of figs or of vines, or of pomegranates ; neither is there any water to drink,” (Numb. xx. 4, 5). The historian asserts, that for the human beings a miraculous supply of

food was provided in the form of manna and quails. But no such provision was made for the inferior animals: yet they are represented as having lived, and supplied victims for the sacrifices and young for the passovers, in this "waste and howling wilderness," for forty years without interruption. It is conceivable that this might have been the case if the Israelites amounted to a few hundred people, with cattle and flocks in proportion, scattered over the whole surface of the country, wherever a well of water or a blade of grass could be found: but that such a land could support domestic animals by millions, for such a space of time, is simply impossible.

We conclude, therefore, that, notwithstanding the repeated statement of upwards of 600,000 grown men, besides women and children, accompanied by immense droves of cattle and sheep—they were, in reality, few in number, and their live stock in proportion. And, indeed, the writer of the Pentateuch ever and anon drops intimations which let us see that this was really the case, notwithstanding his own express and reiterated assertions to the contrary. One of these intimations reaches us in the form of the promise represented as having been made by Jehovah, respecting the driving out of the Canaanites. "I will not drive them out from before thee in one year, lest the land become desolate and the beast of the field multiply against thee. By little and little I will drive them out before thee, until thou be increased and inherit the land," (Exod. xxiii. 29, 30). This would suit very well the case of a few wandering tribes, rushing in from the desert and seizing a fair and fertile region; but is totally unsuitable to the circumstances of a people of 2,000,000, or 2,500,000, invading a territory of 7,000,000 acres in extent, in which, consequently, after their entrance into it, the population would be as dense as that of the three agricultural counties of Norfolk, Suffolk, and Essex, (*Colenso*, pp. 82, 83).

The conclusion from all this is obviously that the narrative in the Pentateuch was written by a person who had no accurate knowledge of the numbers and circumstances of the Hebrew people at the time of the Exodus; and, therefore, neither by Moses himself nor by any of his contemporaries. It is manifest, also, that when such

striking inconsistencies and contradictions are detected in the statements made by the author relating to facts so plain and palpable, we cannot attribute any considerable *vis probandi* to the narrative in which they are found, except in so far as its assertions may be supported by internal probability, or corroborated by external authority.

Since writing the above notice, the second part of the Bishop's work has reached us. We shall probably offer a few remarks on it in the next *Christian Unitarian*. We perceive that the Convocation of the Province of Canterbury has occupied itself with this book. In such a case, proceedings by *authority* are silly. Let the two houses answer Dr. Colenso, if they are able; if not, they had better let him alone.

J. S. P.

CONGREGATIONAL MEMOIRS.

BALLYCARRY (OR BROADISLAND) CONGREGATION.

(*Continued from p. 20.*)

A.D. 1636 to 1646, vacant.

During this vacancy of ten years the Congregation of Ballycarry (or Broadisland) was supplied with occasional preaching, partly by the army chaplains, who attended the Scottish forces under Major-General Robert Monro to Carrickfergus in the month of April, 1642, and partly by Scottish ministers, who, on requisition from the Ulster Presbyterians, were, on several occasions, sent over for that purpose by the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland. In this interval took place the rebellion, or massacre, of 1641, and also the much exaggerated retaliatory massacre at Island Magee, on the 8th of January, 1642. In connexion with the former of these events, a commission was given by certain Protestants of Ulster to their "trustie and weilbelovit friend, James Edmonstone, of Broadeyleland, in the Countie of Antrim, Esquire," authorising him to receive, on their account, from "the Committee for Common Burdings," a supply of arms for their defence, which were furnished, to the value of £1,208 3s 4d. As to the massacre in Island Magee, before detailing the circumstances connected with that event, in so far as Broad-

island was locally concerned, it may be well to quote from the "Rawdon Papers," p. 912, the following account, given by a well-informed contemporary, of the state of the County of Antrim in 1641—1642. "On the 23rd October, 1641, and within a few days after, the Irish rebels made slaughter of all men, women, and children which they could lay hands on, within the County of Antrim, that were Protestants, burning their houses and corn; and such as escaped their fury took sanctuary in the towns of Carrickfergus, Belfast, Lisnagarvey (Lisburn), Antrim, and Larne, and the two houses of Templepatrick and Edindough-Carrick (Shane's Castle), all the said towns and houses lying near the one to the other. The rebels had the command of all the rest of the country, and within musket shot of the towns, and to the very walls of the two houses, until the middle of June, 1642, so as, for near the first eight months of the rebellion, no Protestant had any quarter granted in that part of the county, but only in these towns and two houses, all the rest of the country being under the absolute command of the rebels." Such outrages, of course, provoked retaliation, and accordingly we are not surprised to read in the depositions of James Marshall, as given by him at the time, and as now preserved in the Library of Trinity College, Dublin, that "on Sunday, January 8, 1642, a number of persons from beyond the Bann, and from the neighbourhood of Ballymena, all strangers, met at the village of Ballycarry about sermon time, where they were seen by said James Marshall, on Sabbath forenoon," and being joined by a few soldiers from Carrickfergus, which was then garrisoned by raw and undisciplined levies, and not by regular troops, they proceeded to Island Magee, and unhappily and unwarrantably retaliated on the Roman Catholic inhabitants of that district the barbarous murders which had been committed on their relations and fellow-religionists during the preceding weeks. Absurd exaggerations of this massacre—which, as it actually happened, was bad enough—have been invented by some Roman Catholic historians, and repeated even by some Protestant writers, to state which is to confute them. It has been said that it was the first massacre on either side, which it evidently was not, for it did not take place till January,

1642, whereas the other, and infinitely greater, massacre began, as we have seen, in October, 1641. It has been said that all the inhabitants of Island Magee were thrown over the Gobbins, which manifestly cannot have been the case, seeing that all the inhabitants of Island Magee, even in those days, were not by any means Roman Catholics. The name of a Dissenting landholder, called Hill, is recorded as having saved the lives of a good many of his Roman Catholic neighbours, and doubtless there were many other Dissenters at the time in Island Magee, besides this good Samaritan. It has been also said that all the inhabitants of Island Magee, *in number above three thousand*, men, women, and children, were massacred on this occasion; but this is glaringly false, for all the Roman Catholic inhabitants of Island Magee, at the date referred to, did not probably amount to more than three hundred, and it is not likely that even these were all slain. So that if we set down the number of the victims at thirty, as Dr. Reid and M'Skimin do, instead of three thousand, we shall have an amount which, though still too large, will probably be nearer the truth than the numbers commonly given. M'Skimin shrewdly suggests how easily the original number (30) could be altered, either designedly or otherwise, into the 3,000 which we find in some historians. Before quitting this point, it should be related to the credit of Rev. Dr. O'Connor, a Roman Catholic ecclesiastic, that in one of his works he has the courage to speak of "the pretended massacre of Island Magee," and after clearly proving the ordinary accounts of it to be without foundation, adds, "yet so credulous are our Irish writers, that they have hitherto taken this pretended massacre upon trust as an historical fact."

The army chaplains who, as above stated, came over with Monro in 1642, formed themselves into a Presbytery, which, at its first meeting in Carrickfergus, on the 10th of June in that year (being the first regularly constituted Presbytery ever held in Ireland), was attended by five ministers. "They sent ministers to divers congregations who were first in a case for eldership." Amongst these congregations Broadisland is not named, but I should think that that district, being so near

Carrickfergus, was not without its share in the ministrations of these military pastors. Perhaps, indeed, the fact of Broadisland being adjacent to Carrickfergus, is the reason why it is not expressly named among the missionary stations by Adair, the original authority in this matter. In 1644, the Solemn League and Covenant was administered in the Province of Ulster, by ministers who were sent over from Scotland by the General Assembly for that purpose. A full account of their covenanting tour through the North of Ireland is given in the Adair M.S., as quoted at large by Reid. Amongst the places visited are mentioned Broadisland and Island Magee, where the people are spoken of as "running into it where it was administered." Very likely, but on the principle, *audi alteram partem*, I venture, even in the history of a Presbyterian congregation, to reverse the picture, by inserting the following brief quotation from an Episcopalian annalist of these times. "But alas," says the writer of the Montgomery M.S., "this beautiful order (to wit, 'three trebles, three tenors, three counter-tenors, and three bass voices, equally divided on each side of them, besides the gentlemen scholars, which 'sat scattered in their pews'), appointed and settled by his lordship, lasted no longer than till the Scottish army came over and put their chaplains in our churches; who having power, regarded not law, equity, or right to back or countenance them; they turned out all the legal loyal clergy who would not desert Episcopacy and the Service Book, and take the Covenant, a very bitter pill indeed to honest men; but they found few to comply with them therein, and so they had the more pulpits and schools to dispose of to other dominions for whom they sent letters to Scotland."*

II.—1646–1697. ROBERT CUNNINGHAM.—Of this, the second minister of Broadisland (or Ballycarry), it is stated by Dr. Reid that few particulars are known, in explanation of which fact one of his successors, the late Rev. John Bankhead, was, I believe, in the habit of observing, that Mr. Robert Cunningham lived and died

* See Reid i., pp. 324, 352, 369, 371, 454; ii., 30. Rawdon Papers, p. 91. M'Skimin's Carrickfergus, p. 45, *et seq.* Montgomery M.S. p. 105.

a bachelor, and left no trace behind. In the course, however, of the fifty-one years during which he was minister of Ballycarry (although within that period he was sometimes compulsorily absent from his charge and from the country) he witnessed many stirring scenes, in some of which he was personally concerned. Only three years after his ordination (*i.e.*, in 1649) he was obliged, with Mr. Greg, minister of Carrickfergus, to flee in a boat to the County of Down, on occasion of the surrender of that town to Lord Montgomery, who had joined the Duke of Ormond against the Presbyterians. In 1651 he was more fortunate, being one of the three Presbyterian ministers in the County Antrim (Adair, of Cairncastle, and Kennedy, of Templepatrick, were the others) who were allowed, by the triumphant Independents, to remain unmolested in their parishes. In 1653 he had a narrow escape from being transported to Tipperary, according to a notable plan devised by Oliver Cromwell, and formally published on the 23rd of May in that year, according to which, "as the most probable expedient for the peace and settlement of this province, such persons as were judged therein to be most dangerous, by reason of their interest and disaffection, were to be transplanted into the provinces of Leinster and Munster." The proposed conditions of this transplantation—which, if it had been executed, would have made a Down of Tipperary—were stated at full length. Sir Robert Adair, of Ballymena, Mr. Shaw, of Ballygally, and other leading Presbyterians, were sent to Munster to examine the allotted lands, and a list was actually made out of the names of such as were to remove according to the foregoing declaration. On this list appears the name of Captain Edmonstone, of Broadisland, and if he had gone, doubtless his minister and Presbyterian tenants would have followed him, either voluntarily or otherwise. But the scheme ultimately came to nothing, and the Presbyterians were allowed to remain in the Province of Ulster, which they continue to infest to this day. Even in Broadisland, however, Mr. Cunningham was not without his troubles. "At the visitation of the Kirk of Braidyleland, kept Oct. 11, 1654," it appeared that, although he enjoyed the patronage of the Edmonstone family, yet he was so

ill requited by the people of that parish for his work of the ministry, that the Presbytery were about to disannex him from that Congregation, and declare him to be, in Presbyterian language, "transportable," *i.e.*, removable to another charge. But in the following year, 1655, Colonel Wallace, who had been appointed Governor of Belfast, and who seems to have resided (I presume as a temporary tenant) in Red-Hall, the seat of the Edmonstones, near Ballycarry, "gave so much satisfaction to Mr. Cunningham for his maintenance in Broadisland, that the Presbytery did not declare him transportable at that time."—(*M.S. Minutes of Pres.*, *apud Reid*, ii. 126).

In 1661 something worse than "transportability" overtook Mr. Cunningham. In that year he was, in common with upwards of sixty other Presbyterian ministers in the Province of Ulster, deposed from the ministry and ejected from his benefice, by the Act of Uniformity, which, unfortunately for the fame and inconsistently with the previous character of Jeremy Taylor, was, in the Diocese of Down and Connor, enforced by the amiable and enlightened author of "The Liberty of Prophesying." In the case of Mr. Cunningham, of Broadisland, he must have been additionally grieved, by an aggravated indignity which, in the same year, was inflicted upon another gentleman in his neighbourhood, who was, probably, also his hearer and his friend. "Captain John Dalway, of Bellahill, Mayor of Carrickfergus, was, on the 29th of July, 1661, brought on his knees to the bar of the Irish House of Lords, and fined £100 for not causing the Covenant to be burned," which, doubtless, he had subscribed a few years before. "On the back of all this" (as Adair says) came the troubles connected with "Blood's Plot," to which I need not now further refer, than to state that it caused great woe to the ministers and people of the North. In one day, according to Adair, in the middle of June, 1663, all the ministers of Down and Antrim who could be found, were apprehended, on a false charge of being concerned in this conspiracy, which was really got up by old Cromwellists, who had a rooted antipathy to the King's Government. The ministers of Down were confined in Carlingford; those of Antrim in Carrickfergus; but Mr. Cunningham, of Broadisland, fared better than

(if a bachelor) he deserved, for he had a letter in his favour from my Lady Crauford Lindsay, sister to the Duke of Hamilton, and an acquaintance of the Duchess of Ormond, in consequence of which he was granted liberty to stay in the country in a private capacity.

(To be continued.)

WHAT THE SCRIPTURES TEACH.—No. 2.

WE have seen that the Scriptures teach respecting God—that he is *one*, that he is the Father, and that the Father is the only true God; and also, that they do not mention a Trinity, or teach that God subsists in Three Persons.

We come next to consider what they teach respecting Jesus. They continually represent him as the Christ, *i.e.*, anointed, and as the Son of God. Jesus thus speaks of himself. “The woman saith unto him, I know that Messiah cometh, which is called Christ: when he is come, he will tell us all things. Jesus saith unto her, I that speak unto thee am he.”—John iv. 25, 26. The disciples acknowledge him as the Christ. “We believe and are sure that thou art the Christ.”—John vi. 69. So the apostles preached—“God hath made that same Jesus whom ye crucified, both Lord and Christ.”—Acts ii. 36. Paul said, “This Jesus whom I preach unto you is Christ.”—Acts xvii. 3. So Apollos “mightily convinced the Jews, and that publicly, shewing by the Scriptures that Jesus was Christ.”—Acts xviii. 28. At his baptism Jesus was declared to be the Son of God—“This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased.”—Matt. iii. 17. Also at his transfiguration—Luke ix. 35. John wrote his Gospel to lead men to the belief “that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God.”—John xx. 31.

The Scriptures teach that a belief in Jesus as the Christ, the Son of God, was all that was required of the disciples. “Whom say ye that I am? And Simon Peter answered and said—Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God. And Jesus answered and said unto him, Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-jona: for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which

is in heaven. And I say also unto thee, that thou art Peter, and on this rock I will build my church.”—Matt. xvi. 15—18. Philip baptized the Ethiopian when he confessed that “Jesus Christ is the Son of God.”—Acts viii. 37. “Whosoever confesseth that Jesus is the Son of God, God dwelleth in him, and he in God.”—1 John iv. 15.

The Scriptures teach that Jesus derived his office and his power from God. “God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost and with power.”—Acts x. 38. “I am not come of myself,—my Father sent me. . . . I am from him, and he hath sent me.”—John vii. 28, 29. “The Father that dwelleth in me he doeth the works.”—John xiv. 10. “My doctrine is not mine, but his that sent me.” God has made Jesus to be our Saviour—“We have seen and do testify that the Father sent the Son to be the Saviour of the world,”—1 John iv. 14; and to be our judge,—“Jesus commanded us to preach unto the people, and to testify that it is he which was ordained of God to be the Judge of the quick and dead.”—Acts x. 42. “God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ.”—Rom. ii. 16.

The Scriptures teach that God was in Christ (2 Cor. v. 19); “was with him” (Acts x. 38); revealed God’s character to men (John xvii. 6, 26); that he was thus the image of the invisible God (Col. i. 15); and is called Immanuel (Matt. i. 23). But they also teach that he is not the supreme God. “Ye are Christ’s and Christ is God’s.”—1 Cor. iii. 23. In the end “the Son also himself shall be subject unto him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all.”—1 Cor. xv. 28. Though he is so often called *Son of God*, he is nowhere called, *God the Son*: and when the Jews accused him of making himself God, he denied that he had done so; he said that the term “God” was sometimes in their country applied even to men in authority, but he had only called himself the Son of God,—“If he called them Gods to whom the Word of God came, and the Scripture cannot be broken; say ye of him whom the Father sanctified and sent into the world, Thou blasphemest; because I said, *I am the Son of God*.”—John x. 35, 36.

AN ANGEL SITS BESIDE THE TOMB.

THE mourners came at break of day
Unto the garden sepulchre,
With saddened hearts to weep and pray
For him, the loved one, buried there.
What radiant light dispels the gloom !
An angels sits beside the tomb.

The earth doth mourn her treasures lost,
All sepulchred beneath the snow,
When wintry winds and chilling frost
Have laid her summer glories low.
The spring returns, the flow'rets bloom—
An angel sits beside the tomb.

Then mourn we not beloved dead,
E'en while we come to weep and pray ;
The happy spirit hath but fled
To brighter realms of heavenly day ;
Immortal hope dispels the gloom—
An angel sits beside the tomb.

S. F. ADAMS.

A FREE CHURCH—WHAT DOES IT MEAN?

It is interesting and instructive to note the different ideas which are attached by different sections of the community to "a Free Church." Those who are from principle, and not from fashion or interest merely, attached to the Established Church of England and Ireland, regard their Roman Catholic brethren as spiritually enslaved, rejoice in their own Protestant liberties, and seem to know no freedom beyond the privilege of believing in their Creeds, Articles, and Prayer-Book. Professing to receive the Bible as the only repository of religious truth, they seem to regard with almost equal sacredness the service-book of their Church, and do not venture to dissent from the contradictions and anathemas which it contains ; nor do they manifest any impatience at the political rule to which they are subjected. They flatter themselves with the idea that they possess an open Bible and "a Free Church."

There is an ecclesiastical body of great wealth and influence in Scotland, which, some twenty years ago, withdrew from the Establishment, and assumed the distinctive title of "the Free Church." But, while its founders, by noble efforts and at great sacrifice, vindicated their right to elect their pastors without the interference of patron or Crown, and are so far free, they retain the Westminster Confession as their doctrinal standard, and they exclude from their pulpits and from Church privileges all who do not signify their acceptance of the numerous propositions of that Confession, including the doctrine of election, and of the damnation of non-elect infants. So far from being in any important sense more liberal than the parent Church of Scotland, they are more strictly attached to their creed, and whatever liberality of sentiment exists among the Presbyterians of Scotland is to be found, not in the "Free," but in the Established Church. True Protestantism, we think, implies more freedom than either the Established Church of England or the Free Church of Scotland vouchsafes to its members. Its fundamental principles are the acceptance of the Divine Revelation contained in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, and the right of private judgment in their interpretation; and where human compositions, in the form of Creeds, Articles, and Confessions, are added to the Scriptures, or substituted for them, or where human authority interferes with the exercise of the individual mind in interpreting the Scriptures, the essential spirit of Protestantism is violated, and the Church is not *free*. We recognise in the Non-Subscribing bodies an illustration of a really Free Church, for while they acknowledge the divine authority of Revelation, and reverently receive the Scriptures as their "rule of faith," they refuse subscription to human formularies, and maintain the right of every man to interpret God's Word for himself. Here is true Christian freedom, and the more we examine the principles of Non-Subscription, as held by the little band that withdrew from the General Synod of Ulster in 1726, and the no less illustrious men who seceded from the same body in 1829, the more are we satisfied that they are thoroughly Christian, purely Protestant, and essentially *free*.

But there may be an organization giving still more freedom than even the Non-Subscribing Churches contemplated. They felt themselves constrained to reject the authority of human compositions, but, at the same time, to admit the authority of the Scriptures. This is evident from the fact that their watchword was, "No human authority—the Scriptures our sole rule of faith." They felt constrained to refuse allegiance to their fellow-men, whether in a Synod, Convocation, or Parliament, but, at the same time, to yield undivided and hearty allegiance to Christ, the Son of God and the Saviour of the world. Some men have recently made an effort to organize a Church which shall not be bound to the Scriptures as embodying a divine revelation, nor to the divine authority of Christ, but shall be *absolutely* free—their bond of union being neither Christ, nor Scripture, nor even a belief in God, but merely *a spirit of free inquiry*! Some may say that no such a Church is contemplated. We ask them, then, to read the following remarkable and startling statement, made by a prominent elder of the Presbytery of Antrim, as quoted by Dr. Montgomery in his speech at Carrickfergus, reported in our present number. In reference to the controversy which, twelve months ago, resulted in the disruption of the Presbytery of Antrim, this gentleman said, speaking for himself and others—how many others we do not know :—

"It was our design to build up a Church which should not be exclusively Christian in any sense; which would admit Christians, Deists, Pantheists, Hindoos, and Mahomedans. Atheists would not be excluded, and even if a minister became an Atheist, he should not be required to resign."

There, now, is really a Free Church; and, as every man has a right to his opinion, we should not complain of the extent to which this elder carries his freedom of thought, but should rather admire the frankness with which he gives expression to his views, not hiding them under vague phrases and unmeaning platitudes, as some have a fashion of doing. But we think that it is dishonest to use a Christian organisation for overturning the Christian faith, and we would have admired him and his coadjutors more, if they had withdrawn from the Presbytery of Antrim, which, in its foundation, was distinctly and

exclusively Christian, and formed a society of their own, which, for its novelty, they might have called the New Church, for its laxity the Free Church, for its comprehensiveness the Universal Church, or, to combine these leading characteristics in one euphonious title, they might have called it—*the New Free Church Universal*.

DR. MONTGOMERY AND THE LATE REV. F. BLAKELY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CHRISTIAN UNITARIAN.

SIR,—In accordance with the promise contained in my letter of the 20th ultimo, and published in the *Christian Unitarian* for the present month, I now undertake the very unpleasant and painful duty of showing that Dr. Montgomery, in his *post mortem* indictment of Mr. Blakely, has been unjust to the memory, and slandered the character, of his early and life-long friend. I have been told that Dr. Montgomery's letter needs no reply. It has been repeatedly asserted that, to the thoughtful and intelligent portion of the community, it carries with it its own refutation. And so far as I am able to form an opinion on the matter, the all but universal judgment upon it is, "that it is a production by no means calculated to advance the reputation of Dr. Montgomery, either as an honourable or Christian man;" but, notwithstanding all this, I think a reply is necessary, lest silence should be construed into an admission of the truth of the charges preferred against my father-in-law. When I have done, it will be seen that Dr. Montgomery has made assertions, not only incapable of verification, but capable of the clearest refutation, and has given currency to charges the most unwarrantable and defamatory.

Before, however, proceeding to what is, in my case, in reality, an *enforced* task, I have a preliminary observation or two to make, which have reference to another of the busy actors in this sad scene. I have known Mr. David Orr for many years, and till lately, have known him as a kind, generous, and obliging man, and therefore I regret that, from any cause whatever, he should have become an undesigning tool in the hands of Dr. Montgomery. Most sincerely do I wish that I could erase from the memory of his friends the character which is indelibly written there by Dr. Montgomery's letter. He is represented as Mr. Blakely's favourite elder, and most undoubtedly he was Mr. Blakely's trusted friend; but does not Dr. Montgomery's letter throw great doubt upon the nature of that friendship, by raising the question of Mr. Orr's sincerity? Dr. Montgomery's letter places Mr. Orr before the world in the unenviable character of an eavesdropper at Spamount, and a tale-bearer at Dunmurry—it represents him as the guest of Mr. Blakely to-day, and the retailer of the conversation that passed at his private tea-table to Dr. Montgomery to-morrow. Honourable, certainly, in Mr. Orr to betray the trust which hospitality imposes on all who receive it, and doubly honourable in

Dr. Montgomery to encourage the mean and contemptible practice of tattling in "the worthy man!" I confess I did not think Mr. Orr capable of such conduct; but his character, in this respect, is drawn by Dr. Montgomery's own hand, and I will not add a word to it to deepen Mr. Orr's mortification, or that of his relatives. Biography and autobiography are sometimes unintentionally written, and in the letter under criticism I believe we have an example of both. Dr. Montgomery has sketched Mr. Orr's, and written one of the darkest pages of his own. One thing I know, and that is, if Mr. David Orr will henceforth lend his name to verify groundless charges, publicly circulated by Dr. Montgomery, I shall myself be under the necessity of writing a chapter in biography that will effectually deal with the "unquestionable testimony of a worthy and truthful man."

To proceed now to the duty of rescuing my father-in-law's memory from the defamatory allegations of Dr. Montgomery. I remark, that Mr. Blakely was never, at any time of his life, a rich man, nor, on the contrary, was he ever the pauper Dr. Montgomery's letter represents him. Soon after his settlement in Moneyrea, he purchased a farm of land at a cost of about £1,000. He had himself something like half the purchase-money, and the remainder he, no doubt, had to borrow; but, at no time, was he more than £550 in debt. This, including Dr. Montgomery's "£200 and more" he eventually paid off. He expended largely on his farm, contributed generously when called upon for pecuniary aid, and gave his children a good education; was always glad to see his friends; spent more, probably, without fee or reward, upon denominational matters, than any of his brother ministers; and, when he died, left behind him property to the amount, at least, of £1,000, on which no man had any claim either legal or moral. He had but four children to provide for, and none of them spendthrifts. He had £100 annually of Royal Bounty, £60 annually of stipend, and an excellent farm of 41 statute acres, at the yearly rent of £31.

Such was Dr. Montgomery's pauper, designedly represented thus, that a belief in Mr. Blakely's inability to meet his pecuniary liabilities might gain a ready credence with the public, and that the whole story of his pecuniary indebtedness might be received as an indisputable fact. Burns has well said that "the best-laid schemes o' mice and men gang aft a-gley." And so with the Doctor's story—nobody believes it. Those who best knew Mr. Blakely, cry, Shame! and a number of those with whom he had many transactions told me, but a few weeks ago, that they always found him to be strictly upright and honest. But what is more to my purpose, not only will this character be sustained by the closest inquiry into his worldly transactions, but the fact will be established that Dr. Montgomery, with regard to this money matter, has not been able to make good his public assertions, and all this by his own letters in the correspondence to which I shall immediately direct attention. Of one thing I am as certain as I am of my own existence, and that is, that whatever may have been the pecuniary transactions between them, Mr. Blakely died under the conviction that he was not one penny in Dr. Montgomery's debt. When he left

Ireland, about £30 would have paid all his pecuniary obligations, and when I handed to him certain receipted accounts after the sale of his chattel property, he then declared he owed no man any thing. Before going to Ireland for the purpose just referred to, he mentioned the four or five little accounts he wished me to pay, and over and over again charged me not to overlook or forget any of them, saying, on one occasion, "how much it would grieve him if any one had it in his power to place a 'black mark' after his name." Little did he think that Dr. Montgomery would be the first, and only one, to affix thereto the dreaded symbol.

The following is the correspondence to which allusion has been made, and from which it will be seen that Dr. Montgomery, when put to the test, failed in establishing his assertion that Mr. Blakely died upwards of £100 in his debt. After reading his extraordinary letter, I wrote him, asking him to send me the vouchers for the alleged debt, supposing that, as a voucher is "a paper or document to verify accounts," he would have sent me the account and vouchers together; but in this I was disappointed; and, to prevent all misapprehension on the subject, I wrote a second letter before leaving England, asking for a statement of the pecuniary transactions between him and my father-in-law, and yet, after putting me to the expense and trouble of going to Ireland, he to the last declined to furnish his account. For what reasons the public must judge.

"NETHEREND, January 7th, 1863.

"DEAR SIR,—In the *Christian Unitarian* for this month I see a statement in reference to pecuniary transactions between you and the late Rev. F. Blakely, which astonishes me a good deal. Before Mr. Blakely left Ireland, he was particularly anxious that all his debts should be paid, and gave me a list of them. When I returned to England, after the sale of his chattel property, and submitted to him certain receipted accounts, he then declared he owed no man anything. It seems, however,—if the statement already referred to be correct,—that he overlooked a claim of yours of long standing, and I now write to ask you to send me the vouchers for this debt, which, if sent, I shall duly return. Should you be unable or unwilling to do so, will you permit a friend to inspect them?

"Both my wife, as Mr. Blakely's only surviving child, and myself, as one of his executors, are anxious that all just claims should be met and paid, and should yours, on examination, prove either legal or just, we shall feel it to be our imperative duty to liquidate it also.—Yours very truly,

"WILLIAM COCHRANE.

"Dr. Montgomery."

"DUNMURRY GLEBE, January 10th, 1863.

"DEAR SIR,—I have duly received yours of the 7th inst., which is very creditable to yourself and Mrs. Cochrane, and I assure you, though it will result in my pecuniary gain, that I deeply lament the unwarranted assault of *The Non-Subscriber*, which forced me to vindicate myself by entering into details which otherwise should never have seen the light. The verbal calumnies that were so industriously circulated in Ireland I should not have noticed—

because nobody here *really* believed them, not even the inventors—but, when I was denounced to *the world* as ungenerous and relentless, I had no choice left.

“You seem to think it strange that our good old friend forgot some of his pecuniary indebtedness under his great mental and bodily infirmities; but as you, doubtless, possess his correspondence and mine, when he was in full vigour, you will see that such forgetfulness was not uncommon. I say *forgetfulness*, advisedly, for I am convinced that he was always *thoroughly honest*, though sometimes inconsiderate.

“You seem to doubt ‘the *correctness* of my statement’ and ‘the justice of my claims.’ Happily, I am in a position not only to remove your *doubt* in regard to my ‘statement,’ but to prove how largely I have *understated* my case. As to ‘claims,’ I *have* made none, and I *do* make none; but, as you appear to recognise *possible* claims on my part, I shall cheerfully submit my ‘vouchers’ to ‘the inspection of *any* friend’ whom you may appoint, in accordance with your own suggestion. I would, without hesitation, send you the documents themselves, but they would be comparatively obscure without certain explanations, and, as travelling is neither tedious nor expensive, I venture to suggest, as most satisfactory, that you should come to Ireland and investigate the whole case. Should you come, I predict that you will learn more than you expect. I *earnestly* trust that you *will* come, and bring with you my letters—doubtless in your possession—to Mr. Blakely, as, unfortunately, I neglected, save in one or two cases, to keep copies of them. Mr. B.’s I have, and Mr. David Orr has seen them.

“If you employ a friend to inspect my ‘vouchers,’ be good enough to send the letters to him, as they will aid our settlement.

“Amazed and mortified that the names of F. B. and H. M., *living or dead*, should be disagreeably associated, I am, dear Sir, yours very truly,

“H. MONTGOMERY.

“Rev. Wm. Cochrane.”

“DUNMURRY, *January 22nd*, 1863.

“DEAR SIR,—A strange fatality seems to attend our correspondence. Last year a letter and receipt of yours never reached my hands, although my residence is so much in the ‘gangway of the world,’ and it is now almost a fortnight since I replied to your favour of the 7th inst., yet I have not heard from you in return.

“This last may have arisen, doubtless, from your waiting to communicate with some friends in Ireland; but, lest my letter of the 10th inst. should have failed to reach you, owing to yours being merely dated, ‘Netherend, Brierly Hill,’ but naming *no Shire*, I send you a copy to prevent you supposing me capable of wilful incivility. This I send through Mr. Maginnis—Stourbridge being well known.

“The matter at issue, be it remembered, originated solely with *yourself*, for I neither mooted, nor do I press, anything; and, should some advantage accrue to me out of undeserved reproach and annoyance, it will be in the ordinary course of God’s good

Providence, to which, on other occasions, I have been so wonderfully indebted.—I am, dear Sir, yours truly,

“H. MONTGOMERY.

“Rev. W. Cochrane.”

“CHAPEL VESTRY, *January 25th, 1863.*

“DEAR SIR,—Your letter of the 22nd inst. has just been put into my hand, and I hasten to send you a hurried reply.

“Perhaps I should have acknowledged your previous letter; but I did not think it necessary to do so till I could make some definite arrangement for settling the question of Mr. Blakely’s pecuniary indebtedness to you.

“I was willing to act upon your suggestion of a personal visit to Ireland, believing that in this way the matter could be most satisfactorily arranged; but, before leaving home, I had to provide supplies both for Netherend and the Lye, which was a matter of uncertainty and difficulty. Moreover, the weather has been very unfavourable, a consideration which has its weight with a bad sailor. However, I believe I can now say that I have obtained the necessary supplies for my pulpits, and that, if the weather be at all propitious, I will be in Belfast about the middle of the week. In order to expedite arrangements, I shall feel obliged if you will, at your *earliest convenience*, send to me at Mr. Barry’s, 22, Princes Street, a *statement of your pecuniary transactions* with Mr. Blakely. When I look over it, a day mutually convenient—perhaps, Monday week—may be appointed for the verification of the account.—Yours very truly,

“WILLIAM COCHRANE.

“Dr. Montgomery.”

“DUNMURRY GLEBE, *January 28th, 1863.*

“DEAR SIR,—Mr. Blakely and I were not quite worldly-minded and systematic enough to keep a Dr. and Cr. account for some thirty-five years, so that it could be furnished as if from the ledger of a bank, or a merchant’s office. I shall be able, however, to produce, under my old friend’s own hand, abundant evidence of all my published statements,—and more.

“You, of course, will be able to produce my communications to *him*, and a few comparisons and explanations will, I expect, render all distinct, and lead to an *equitable* settlement, as you have honourably suggested.

I am very glad that you have resolved to come over; and, when you shall have arrived, I venture to propose, as the means of preventing all misconception, that at our friendly conference, each of us shall be accompanied by an intelligent friend, well-versed in calculations, to assist us in reaching a proper decision.

“If you adopt this suggestion, I *pledge* myself to select a friend who shall know nothing concerning the case, by word or document, until the moment of our meeting.

“At any time and place which you may appoint, I shall be happy to meet you; and am, dear Sir, yours truly,

“Rev. W. Cochrane.”

“H. MONTGOMERY.

"22, PRINCES STREET, *January 28th*, 1863.

"DEAR SIR,—I am in receipt of your letter of this day's date. I cannot understand what advantage would be gained by a meeting such as you suggest, when the business would be merely confined to reading over a lengthened correspondence, which appears to me not to touch the matter in dispute.

"You have publicly reproached the memory of my father-in-law with incurring pecuniary defalcations to you, not by the non-payment of the principal sums borrowed, but for an unsettled account of interest, amounting, 'you are convinced, to upwards of £100.'

"Now, I ask you to give me a fair statement of this interest account, with the written vouchers, which you state are in your possession, to prove its correctness, and if the statement is satisfactory, I am prepared to satisfy it in full; but, if unsatisfactory, I shall then ask you for further information. This, I consider, I am entitled to—in fact, I demand it—for I scarcely think you would have ventured on a statement so defamatory without being able at once to substantiate the facts by unimpeachable evidence.

"I am persuaded that Mr. Blakely, at his death, did not believe himself indebted to you one shilling. As I told you before, he died in the belief that he was indebted to no man; and I am not requiring from you anything that is either unreasonable or unfair, when I ask you for a statement of the alleged debt.

"I need only further say, that, having come from England for the express purpose of having this matter arranged, I beg you will give me an immediate reply, as my stay in Belfast must necessarily be limited.—Yours very truly,

"WM. COCHRANE.

"Dr. Montgomery."

"DUNMURRY GLEBE, *January 29th*, 1863.

"DEAR SIR,—I feel somewhat surprised, though not much, at the strange tenor and imperious tone of your letter of yesterday's date.

"When recently compelled, by the circulation of unscrupulous calumnies, to vindicate my conduct towards my late worthy friend, by entering into certain details which would otherwise have rested in oblivion, *you* voluntarily, and through no demand of *mine*, proposed an equitable settlement of my pecuniary claims.

"Deeming this proposal to be at once honourable and *bona fide*, I suggested a simple method of arriving at the facts and equity of the case, which you seemed to admit would be "satisfactory." To carry out that plan, without delay, and so as to obviate any misunderstanding, I proposed the presence of two intelligent friends at our conference, who should inspect *my* vouchers and other documents, and also *yours*.

"You strangely say, 'this would confine the business to reading over a lengthened correspondence which appears not to touch the matter in dispute.' On the other hand, I maintain that, with the exception of a 'settled account,' under Mr. Blakely's own hand, the correspondence constitutes the whole *gist* of the case, which could not be understood without it. You, of course,

have it in your possession, as I specially requested you to bring it with you, and so far from being long, less than half an hour would suffice to read it.

"Probably, however, there may be some portions of it which you would not wish 'indifferent parties to see,' and, therefore, I am ready to meet you, *individually*, for the friendly and equitable comparison of our documents and views.

"To this reasonable proposition you cannot object, unless you desire (which I by no means insinuate) to back out of your honourable offer of settlement.

"As to your high 'demand' and your hint of 'seeking further information,' I am quite prepared, and you may possibly learn more than you expect.—In much haste, dear Sir, yours truly,

"H. MONTGOMERY.

"Rev. Wm. Cochrane."

"22, PRINCES STREET, BELFAST, *Jan. 30th*, 1863.

"DEAR SIR,—I am in receipt of yours of the 29th inst. I decline to have any personal intercourse with you, until you furnish me with the statement of account by which you make out that the late Mr. Blakely died in your debt '*upwards of one hundred pounds.*' I repeat that you have publicly reproached the memory of my father-in-law with this default, and in terms which clearly insinuate moral obliquity on his part. You made the statement on your own responsibility, and now strangely invite me to assist you in verifying assertions, the truth of which, so far as my knowledge of the facts extends, I utterly deny.

"I therefore once more call upon you for a statement of the alleged debt, and it will be quite time enough to see you personally or by deputy on the subject, in case I should require any explanation of your figures. As I said before, I have come to this country specially to settle this business, and, as my time is here limited, *I give you until Monday next, February 2*, to render me the statement of Mr. Blakely's debt to you. If you still refuse to comply with this fair and reasonable request, now made, I believe, for the third time, I shall then assume that you are unable to do so, and treat your defamatory allegation as a fabrication of your own, raised up to excuse your unfeeling behaviour to a dying friend.—Yours very truly,

"WM. COCHRANE.

"Dr. Montgomery."

"DUNMURRY GLEBE, *January 30th*, 1863.

"REV. SIR—Being quite aware of the design with which your letter of this date was written, I make no comment concerning its spirit, style, and substance, beyond saying, that, as the production is doubtless satisfactory to yourself, it is also perfectly satisfactory to me.

"On the 7th inst., you very creditably made a voluntary offer to meet any claim of mine against our late friend, 'which, on examination should prove to be either legal or *just*;' and, in order to ascertain the fact of legality or justice, you requested me 'to permit a friend to inspect the vouchers for the debt.'

"All this was perfectly proper, and I at once agreed to your proposal; yes, and more; for I offered to lay my vouchers under Mr. Blakely's own hand, both before your friend and yourself, either conjointly or separately.

"*Why* you have receded from your own proposal is best known to yourself; and I now request you to return to it, as the surest means of satisfying the claims of justice, and preventing consequences which you cannot foresee.

"I concluded, as a matter of equity and common sense, that, as *you originated* the affair, and sought the inspection of *my* documents, you would gladly produce those in your *own* possession, to assist in elucidating the case, so that nothing might remain dark or mysterious.

"*Why* you object to this course, which is pursued, I believe, in all settlements of accounts, I am unable to comprehend; but, as you do so, I now offer to submit *my* vouchers without demanding yours, *certain* that you cannot resist their evidence.

"You have used hard words, Mr. Cochrane, but I pass them by 'without note or comment,' and *advise* you, in no unkind spirit, to settle the affair honourably and quietly, for, believe me, I possess ample means of self-vindication, if compelled again to enter upon the painful duty.

"Hoping, on Monday, to receive a satisfactory reply to my reasonable, and just, and conciliatory overtures, I am, Rev. Sir, your faithful servant,

"H. MONTGOMERY."

"Rev. Wm. Cochrane."

"22, PRINCES STREET, January 31st, 1863.

"REV. SIR,—I have yours of yesterday. As a preliminary to any inspection of your alleged vouchers, I *must* have your statement of account against my father-in-law. This, I expect, will show me what amount of money he was indebted to you, when the debt was created, and what payments you may have received from time to time on account. Such is the universal practice, and, if adopted by you in the present case, would narrow our business into a very small compass indeed.

"Nothing can be fairer than the request I have so often made. *If you have any data at all*, to justify your allegations of Mr. Blakely's pecuniary indebtedness to you, let me now see your figures without further evasion or delay. If, on the other hand, you have been led to make hasty assertions, which, on reflection, you cannot maintain, your own character, and Mr. Blakely's memory, demand from you an ample and public apology.

"I have only further to state, that I have not receded, as you assert, nor do I wish to recede from any proposition I have made; but I am determined to insist on your statement of account being rendered, before examining your vouchers or having any personal intercourse with you.

"Unless, therefore, you comply with this, my repeated request, I must decline any further correspondence on the subject.—Very truly yours,

"WM. COCHRANE."

"Dr. Montgomery."

“DUNMURRY GLEBE, February 2nd, 1863.

“REV. SIR,—As you have *shrunk* from the fulfilment of your *own* equitable overtures, and, at the same time, declined to accept *mine*, I await your next ‘move’ with perfect complacency, and am, your faithful servant,

“H. MONTGOMERY.

“Rev. Wm. Cochrane.”

So closed my first, and I trust, also, my last correspondence with Dr. Montgomery. I have not many observations to make upon it, but two or three are necessary. I begin with the last letter, and remark that the first clause of it is simply *untrue*. Every one who reads the correspondence will see that it is *untrue*, and Dr. Montgomery, when he wrote it, knew it to be untrue. Before going to Ireland, I asked him to send me his vouchers for the alleged debt, never dreaming but that they would be accompanied by the account they were intended to verify, and, lest there should be any mistake, in my second letter I asked *distinctly* for a *statement of the pecuniary* transactions between him and Mr. Blakely; but I have not *receded* from any proposal or overture I ever made in the matter. My letters will show that I used all available means to obtain a furnished account, as a preliminary, absolutely necessary, to any satisfactory settlement of the business in hand. And now I feel myself justified in concluding, and that from his own letters, that Dr. Montgomery is *unable to substantiate* the *accusation of pecuniary indebtedness* to him, so publicly and offensively made in the *Christian Unitarian* of January last.

And this conclusion is strengthened by Dr. Montgomery's own admission. Who could have supposed, from the clear and unequivocal statement in his public indictment, that there was any weakness or defect in the evidence, by which he had it in his power to support so defamatory an accusation? Yet, in his very first letter, this weakness is manifested, when he tells us that *his vouchers would be comparatively obscure without certain explanations*. Next, he informs us, that he and Mr. Blakely were not worldly-minded enough to keep a *Debtor and Creditor account* for thirty-five years, so that it could be furnished as from the ledger of a bank or a merchant's office. And lastly, he “*expects*” that if I would give him a helping hand, and produce Mr. Blakely's papers, we might be able together, after a comparison of “documents and views,” to make out a clear case. Now, verily, a mountain has been in labour, and not even a mouse has been produced.

The correspondence, Mr. Editor, which I have now been compelled to publish in self-vindication, has extended to such a length that I cannot trespass, at present, further on your space. Several charges of a still more serious nature than that I have now disposed of remain to be noticed, and with your permission I will address myself to them next month.—Yours, very truly,

WILLIAM COCHRANE.

NETHEREND, February 17th, 1863.

INTELLIGENCE.

SCOTTISH UNITARIAN ASSOCIATION.

On Monday evening, January 5, the annual meeting of this Association was held in St. Mark's Chapel, Edinburgh. A statement of the accounts for the past year was submitted by the Treasurer, from which it appeared that, after discharging all liabilities, there was a balance on hand. The report stated that steps would be taken forthwith to appoint a missionary in connexion with the Association. Officers for the ensuing year were appointed. A social meeting was held in the chapel at seven o'clock—George Hope, Esq., the President, in the chair. On the platform were, the Rev. J. J. Tayler, Principal of Manchester New College, London (who had preached anniversary sermons on the previous day), H. W. Crosskey, R. B. Drummond, and others. Addresses were delivered by the Chairman, by Mr. Crosskey, who spoke on the distinctive principles of Unitarianism, and by Mr. Drummond, who moved a cordial vote of thanks to Mr. Tayler for his services on the Sunday, and for his attendance at their annual meeting. Mr. Tayler, in responding, dwelt on the importance of a manly avowal of our honest convictions, and expressed his sympathy with the work which Mr. Drummond was carrying on in Edinburgh. Mr. Warren, as the representative of the Aberdeen congregation, then made a statement as to the prosperity of the Unitarian cause in that city. A number of hymns, accompanied on the organ, were sung during the evening.

AID TO THE DISTRESSED LANCASHIRE OPERATIVES.

While generous efforts have been made in many quarters to relieve the distress which prevails to so fearful an extent in Lancashire and other parts of the North of England, it is gratifying to be able to record the noble liberality of many of the Unitarian congregations in London and other parts of England. Among the collections recently made the following are announced,—Little Portland Street Chapel, £255; Kentish-town, £111; Hackney, £434; Brixton, £104; Renshaw Street, Liverpool, £630; Hope Street, Liverpool, £383; Bristol, £122. Less affluent congregations have also contributed liberally according to their means.

Collections for the same benevolent object have been made in several of the Unitarian congregations in Ireland. In Ballymena £6 14s. were collected, in Holywood £16 4s., in Dromore £24 7s. 5d. Of others we have received no report.

ORDINATION DINNER AT CARRICKFERGUS.

At the conclusion of the ordination services, which we reported last month, the Rev. R. Cleland and the other ministers present were entertained at dinner in the Town-Hall, Dr. Marshall, one of the trustees of the Meeting-house, in the chair, and Mr. Kain, another trustee, occupying the vice-chair. About fifty gentlemen were present. After the usual introductory toasts, the Chairman

gave "The Remonstrant Synod of Ulster," which was replied to by the Rev. Joseph M'Fadden, Moderator. He referred to the principles on which the Remonstrant Synod had been founded, and showed that the questions put to candidates were in no sense a human creed. The Chairman next gave the health of their newly-ordained pastor, the Rev. Robert Cleland.

The Rev. Dr. MONTGOMERY rose and begged, at this stage of the proceedings, to make a statement explanatory of the peculiar position in which the Remonstrant Congregation of Carrickfergus was at present placed. He gave a succinct but most lucid narrative of the origin and principles of the Remonstrant Synod, and showed that the New Code was not an infringement of the liberties of the people, but an enlargement of them. He also referred to the history of the Congregation of Carrickfergus, and the divisions that had recently arisen in it. He described the recent proceedings by which a minority had, by a trick, nominally withdrawn it from the Remonstrant Synod, and joined the Presbytery of Antrim, and stated that reasonable propositions had been made by the Remonstrant party for an amicable adjustment of differences. He thus concluded one of the ablest speeches it has ever been our privilege to listen to:—This battle, gentlemen, has far more in it than the interests of a small congregation. There is a great principle wrapped up in it. The time was when unbelief, if it did exist, kept itself concealed in private; but a great change has been made of late years, through the encouragement of certain men who have degraded their profession in the Church of England, who hold livings in it, but have sought to undermine Christianity itself. These men have given courage to infidelity. There is a cropping up of it everywhere. Many now avow what they were ashamed to avow before. I never called these men infidels in my life. I said this—that their system would allow the introduction of infidelity, or even Atheism, into our pulpits. That was all I ever said. I would not like you to put me to my oath whether I thought any more. But I happen to have a document in my pocket which will show more than a mere tendency. It will show design. This is a statement of an elder of the Presbytery of Antrim, rather a distinguished elder, one who voted stoutly for the reception of your congregation into the Presbytery of Antrim. He says—"It was our design to build up a Church which should not be exclusively Christian in any sense; which would admit Christians, Deists, Pantheists, Hindoos, and Mahometans." The person to whom this was said, inquired whether they would exclude Atheists. He replied that Atheists would not be excluded—men would not be excluded from Christian pulpits who denied the existence of God! Atheists would not be excluded; and, even if a minister became an Atheist, this elder thought he should not be required to resign. I pointed to the tendency; I show you what was the object. I honestly believe, that that is a secret object. I believe it is hostility to Christianity that has raised them to these exertions; and, although I do not accuse them all of knowing the gulf into which they are running, I do say a great number of their leaders are urging them, as far as they can, to the destruction of Christianity, and to the ruin of the peace and happiness of families. And I do

implore you, my fellow-Christians, in these times when mockery and scoffing have taken the place of faith and practice, that you will become more faithful to your Christian principles, more zealous for the diffusion of rational Christianity, which will take away from those minds a great deal of the grounds on which they found their opposition to Christianity altogether. I implore you to remember for yourselves, for your Church, and for your country, that the moment you arrive at the destruction of Christianity, you connive at the destruction of your own peace, at the destruction of all that is near and dear to you.

The Rev. R. CLELAND then, in appropriate and feeling terms, returned thanks for the honour that had been done him. "The Northern Presbytery of Antrim" was spoken to by the Rev. C. Porter; The Officiating Ministers, by the Rev. W. Crozier; and "*The Christian Unitarian*," by the Rev. C. J. M'Alester. The Revs. J. A. Crozier, Moore Getty, and J. Jennings also spoke. Mr. George Ledlie, in replying to "The Ballyclare Congregation," took occasion to correct certain misrepresentations which had been circulated through the *London Inquirer* and other publications, in which it was most falsely alleged, that the disputes which had arisen in the Congregation were caused by Dr. Montgomery and Rev. J. S. Porter, and that the Ballyclare people were the dupes of those reverend gentlemen. He showed that the elements of discord had existed years before; that the people had exercised the greatest forbearance; and that the disunion which at length occurred was to be attributed solely to the folly and obstinacy of Mr. Hall, and the advice of injudicious friends. He commented severely on the part which the Rev. John Porter and the Rev. S. C. Nelson had taken in fomenting their disputes. The health of M. Andrews, Esq., and also of the Chairman and Vice-Chairman was afterwards drunk. The proceedings were throughout most interesting and important, as connected with the Carrickfergus Congregation and the controversy that now agitates the Non-Subscribing Churches in Ulster.

MONEYREA CONGREGATION.—This congregation has given a unanimous call to Mr. John Berryhill, at present a student in connexion with the Non-Subscribing Association. We understand that Mr. Berryhill has accepted the call. We sincerely hope that his settlement may be a happy and useful one.

BELFAST DOMESTIC MISSION.—The annual examination of the schools in connexion with this valuable Institution was held on February 3, in the presence of R. Nesbitt, Esq., Inspector, and many of the friends of the Mission and parents of the pupils. The answering was most satisfactory, and premiums were distributed to the most deserving. The only matter for regret was the absence of Mr. and Miss Whitla, to whose generosity the Institution is so largely indebted. Mr. Bowring addressed a few words of advice to the children and their parents at the close.

GIRVAN.—The small congregation of Unitarian Christians at Girvan, Scotland, were lately favoured with a visit of the Rev. C. J. M'Alester, of Holywood. On Sabbath, February 1st, that gentle-

man preached two admirable discourses to good audiences, in defence and illustration of Scriptural views of Christianity. On the previous and following days he kindly visited the members at their houses. It is earnestly desired that such visits of our Irish brethren were more frequent.—*Communicated.*

SOIREE AT BANBRIDGE.—On the evening of February 12, the members of the Second Unitarian Congregation, Banbridge, held a Soiree, which was numerous attended. After tea in the school-room, the party repaired to the meeting-house, and the Rev. D. Gordon was called to the chair. "Sunday-School Education" was spoken to by the Rev. J. Montgomery; "John Wesley, and men of earnest faith and Catholic spirit," by the Rev. H. Lindsay; "Our friends of other denominations," by Counsellor Frazer; "Music," by Mr. Cooper, who presided at the harmonium; and "Our Mothers, Sisters, and Wives," by the Rev. W. B. Minniss.

MEETING OF TEACHERS' UNION.—On the evening of February 19, a meeting of this society was held in the Vestry of the Second Meeting-house, Belfast.—Rev. C. J. M'Alester in the chair. The proceedings were begun by devotional exercises, conducted by the Rev. J. Jellie. The Rev. T. Bowring read an interesting paper on "The Sunday-School—its origin and aim," which was followed by remarks from most of the gentlemen present. The attendance was unusually large. Another meeting will be held on the evening of March 12, in same place, at half-past seven o'clock.

OBITUARY.

February 3, at Larne, Anne, wife of Miles Atkinson, Esq.

January 30, at Ventnor, Isle of Wight, William Montgomery Esq., of Mount Anville Lodge, Dublin, aged 34 years.

February 8, at Beech Cottage, Warrenpoint, Mary, eldest surviving daughter of the Rev. James Lunn, of Carlingford.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

The Rev. Dr. Montgomery requests us to say, that he shall not notice any attacks made upon him by the Rev. W. Cochrane, or others, until his assailants shall have had ample time for the full development of such case as they may be able to lay before the public.

We regret to be obliged to hold over, for next number, the Rev. R. Cleland's Statement of Belief, and a report of the Soiree at Paisley, although the former is in type.

All Articles intended for insertion should be sent to the Editor not later than the 12th of the preceding month. As a general rule, no Article should occupy more than *six*, or, at most, *eight* pages.

Communications for the Editor, to be addressed by post to Rev. C. J. M'Alester, Holywood; or, otherwise, to 45, Arthur Street, Belfast.

THE CHRISTIAN UNITARIAN.

Vol. II.]

APRIL, 1863.

[No. 3.

WHAT IF THE MIRACLES BE NOT TRUE?

THERE is a disposition in a certain class of thinkers in more churches than one, to make light of the miraculous in Christianity, or to reject it altogether. It is the spirit of Christ's religion, they say, and its pure and holy precepts, which are important, and it matters little to us whether Christ ever worked a miracle, or was ever raised from the dead. We admire the spirit of the Gospel, and acknowledge the value of its teachings, and we are disposed to leave the matter of miracles and the resurrection of Christ an "open question." Some may believe, and some may disbelieve, but the value of the Christian religion is not affected by the decision.

Such are the views which have lately become somewhat fashionable; and so far have they reached, that ministers of religion have sometimes from their pulpits argued against the Christian miracles, and laboured to prove that they are mere fables. If the miraculous in the Gospel narrative be true, it gives authority to our Lord's doctrine, satisfying the believer that God was with him, and that he spoke the words of God; but while some appear to make light of the supernatural, and regard it as no important element in our religion, it may be interesting to inquire—*What if the miracles be not true?*

In the records of Christ's history miracles hold a prominent place, nor are they confined to one particular portion of his life; they signalize the beginning of his ministry, accompany his teaching, and are most remarkable in connexion with his death. If they be untrue—mere accretions that have grown upon the traditional history of the life of Jesus—perhaps the offspring of superstition or of priestcraft—we must remove them

from the Gospel pages in order that we may more correctly apprehend the life and doctrine of the Saviour. Let us, then, expunge the narrative of miraculous events which attended his baptism, the dove-like descent of the Spirit, and the heavenly testimony to Jesus as the beloved Son of God; and let us blot out the record of his wonderful works during the entire period of his ministry, as the stilling of the tempest, the cleansing of the lepers, the healing of the sick, and the restoring of the dead to life. But it is not enough to cancel the statement of such works; we must also take away the beautiful sentiments and holy truths which are entwined with them. If our Lord did not restore to sight the blind man in Jerusalem, and if the alleged miracle is a fable, then we must remove with it the sublime discourse which is based upon it, in which he speaks of himself as the light of the world, claims for himself so intimate a union with God, and appeals to his works as evidence that the Father had sanctified him and sent him into the world. If he did not assuage the angry tempest, then we lose that holy and sublime "Peace, be still," which, to the believing heart, has bespoken not the power merely to still the raging storm, but also to lull the tempests of passion that so often swell in the human soul. If he did not restore to weeping parents a beloved child, on whose fair form death had set its cold seal, neither did he utter the words, "She is not dead but sleepeth"—words that have so often brought hope and comfort to bereaved ones, and helped them to bear the severest trials. If Christ did not bring back to life the buried Lazarus, neither did he speak that sublime and glorious sentence, "I am the resurrection and the life," which has brought light and peace to many a dying bed, and has enabled sorrowing survivors to look beyond the dark and silent grave to a bright and blessed immortality. But, indeed, our Lord's teachings are so mixed up with his miracles, and built upon them, that in rooting out the supernatural, you tear away with them many of his most sublime discourses. And you do more; you destroy the Saviour's character as a divine teacher, or even as a wise instructor, and reduce him to the condition of a rash enthusiast, or a consummate hypocrite. For, whether the

miracles be realities or fables, our Lord continually appeals to them as evidences of his divine mission. The Jews might be disposed to reject his words, however reasonable and earnest; but he says, "Though ye believe not me, believe the works; that ye may know and believe that the Father is in me and I in him." Now, we can conceive that a man under the influence of fanaticism might imagine that God had sent him, and had given him supernatural power; and we can suppose that a designing hypocrite might attempt to impose on a credulous and superstitious people by pretending to work miracles; but, if the miracles be not true, and if the sacred records give us anything at all approaching to a correct account of Christ's words, he must have been either a fanatic or an impostor—a melancholy alternative surely, whichever of them we adopt.

The resurrection of Christ holds a very prominent place in the Christian system, and the Evangelists minutely record it; but if the miracles be not true, this portion of the Gospels must be expunged, and the history of our Saviour must end with that impressive scene in which the affectionate disciples beg his body, and, wrapping it in linen cloth, lay it in the tomb of Joseph, there to moulder in decay. What a sweep is thus made of the holiest scenes on which pious Christians have throughout so many ages been used to meditate! The interview between Mary and her Lord in the grey dawn of that Sunday morning—the holy words of Jesus, "I ascend to my Father and your Father, to my God and your God"—the reviving faith of Peter and John, and of the other disciples—and that most touching scene in which Jesus joins the two disciples on their way to Emmaus at eventide, and talks with them of the stirring events of the past day or two, expounding to them the Scriptures, and showing them that the Christ ought to have suffered, and to enter into his glory, so that their hearts burned within them—these, and all the other incidents connected with the resurrection of Christ, so rich in consolation and so suggestive of the holiest thoughts, are nothing more than idle tales, if the resurrection be not a fact.

But this is not all. We find that the disciples of Christ are represented as going forth to preach the Gospel; and

one great theme on which they dwelt with peculiar earnestness was the resurrection of their Lord. That seemed indeed to be on many occasions the great burden of their teaching. On it they rested their cause; from it they drew their strongest arguments to persuade, arouse, and convert the world. Let it be remembered that their preaching was not refined disquisitions about the human soul—its natural instincts and affections, nor yet dry and philosophical discourses on men and manners; but they preached Christ crucified and Christ risen from the dead—"Whom ye slew and hanged upon a tree, him God raised from the dead." They do not make it a matter of minor importance, or "an open question" whether Christ's resurrection was a reality. Everywhere in the preaching and writing of the apostles this glorious truth rises up, and forces itself upon our attention. Now, if the miracles be not true, the apostles have been labouring under a mistake, and that which they made the ground of their most earnest exhortations, for which they exposed themselves to suffering and death, was only a superstition or a falsehood; and in rejecting it, we must cut away from the Scriptures every allusion to Christ's resurrection which they contain, the earnest appeals which the apostles rest upon it, and the precious consolations which they draw from it. The triumphant exclamation of Paul, which has fallen like dew from heaven on many a fainting and anguished soul—"O death, where is thy sting! O grave, where is thy victory!" becomes worse than meaningless; for the foundation on which it rests is a fable! And the apostles themselves, whom we have been wont to regard as safe exponents of religious truth, turn out to be only deceivers, or the victims of deception, for the great theme of their preaching is a falsehood.

If the miracles be not true, we must expunge from the New Testament many of the most important doctrines by which the human mind has been enlightened and the human heart has been sustained and comforted amid the trials and bereavements of life; and if the records be to any extent faithful, we must regard Christ and his apostles as knaves or fools; or, if the record be false, we may adopt the supposition that Jesus was a good and truthful man, who drew to him several earnest followers

and endeavoured to instruct and reform his countrymen. In either case, that religion which, for eighteen centuries, has exercised a mighty, beneficent, and ever-increasing influence in the world, is based upon fables, and no more entitled to our homage than the teachings of some Grecian or Chinese moralist.

We cannot afford thus lightly to part with a religion which is so powerful to sustain, to comfort, and to sanctify the soul; we believe that the miracles are true, and we reject that chilling theory which, though it may be presumptuously baptized with the name of Christian, is nothing more—we hope it is nothing less—than Deism.

THE FUTURE LIFE.

How shall I know thee in the sphere which keeps
 The disembodied spirits of the dead,
 When all of thee that time could wither sleeps
 And perishes among the dust we tread?

For I shall feel the sting of ceaseless pain,
 If there I meet again thy gentle presence not;
 Nor hear the voice I love, nor read again
 In thy serenest eyes the tender thought.

Wilt not thy own meek heart demand me there?
 That heart whose fondest throbs to me were given!
 My name on earth was ever in thy prayer,
 Shall it be banished from thy tongue in heaven?

In meadows fanned by heaven's life-breathing wind,
 In the resplendence of that glorious sphere
 And larger movements of the unfettered mind,
 Wilt thou forget the love that joined us here?

The love that lived through all the stormy past,
 And meekly with my harsher nature bore,
 And deeper grew and tenderer to the last,—
 Shall it expire with life, and be no more?

A happier lot than mine, and larger light
 Await thee there ; for thou hast bowed thy will
 In cheerful homage to thy rule of right,
 And lovest all, and renderest good for ill.

Yet, though thou wearest the glory of the sky,
 Wilt thou not keep the same beloved name,
 The same fair thoughtful brow and gentle eye,
 Lovelier in heaven's sweet climate, yet the same ?

Shalt thou not teach me, in that calmer home,
 The wisdom that I learned so ill in this—
 The wisdom which is love—till I become
 Thy fit companion in the world of bliss ?

W. C. BRYANT.

CONGREGATIONAL MEMOIRS.

BALLYCARRY (OR BROADISLAND) CONGREGATION.

(Continued from p. 55.)

WITH the year 1671 begins the MS. volume of "Minutes of the Antrim Meeting," to which I have referred, and from which I make the following quotations relating to Broadisland (or Ballycarry), at the dates mentioned:—

"AT BALLYCLARE, December 5, 1671. The brethren appointed to visit the parish of Broadisland gave in their report that they visited that Parish, and were well satisfied both with the minister's diligence and the promises of the people.

"AT LARNE, May 7, 1673. The meeting being informed of the want of a preaching-house in Ballycarry, the brethren appointed Mr. Adam Getty to preach there on Tuesday come-eight-days, and to press the people to the duty of building a preaching-house, and to give report to the next meeting.

"AT BALLYCARRIE, June 3, 1673. Notwithstanding former diligence used by Mr. Getty in affairs relating to Mr. Robert Cunningham and this parish, the meeting hath this report concerning them, viz., that Mr. Cunningham is much withheld as to his maintenance ; that the meeting-house is not, as yet, builded ; and, withal, that the man whose property the former house is doth threaten to take the house from the parish and convert it to his own private use, as formerlie, in default of the payment of three years by-gone rent. The meeting appoints Mr. John Haltridge (of Islandmagee) to travail with the people of that Congregation anent both particulars and labour to draw them to duty, with notification that if they take not an effectual course therein, the meeting will be necessi-

tated to dispose otherwise of Mr. Robert Cunningham. Mr. John Haltridge to report his diligence to the next meeting.

"AT LARNE, February 3, 1674. Appoints an account to be taken of the parishes of Cairncastle, Inver (Larne), Broadisland, and Islandmagee, at next meeting. Mr. Hall (of Larne) to visit Broadisland.

"AT LARNE, March 3, 1674. Renewed the appointment upon Mr. Hall with reference to the parish of Broadisland.

"AT LARNE, April 7, 1674. Anent Broadisland, reported by Mr. Thomas Hall, that he visited that parish according to appointment, and found that people very defective in matter of a maintenance to their minister; they enjoyed his ministry one full year for nothing, and no word of applotting for either the year commencing at All Saints, 1672, nor for the year current. Appear Matthew Logan and George Straight, from the parish of Broadisland, declaring:—1. That they are sensible of their short-coming in duty to their minister. 2. That they are laying down a way for securing him in £30 per annum for the future, only some of the bondsmen (*i.e.*, the men who bound themselves for the stipend) refuse to engage for their proportion, in regard the people failing in their portion refuse to bind themselves to relieve them. The meeting lays it upon them, in name of the rest, to take some effectual course, both for adjusting arrears and satisfying for the future, and require a report of their diligence to be delivered to the meeting."

Leaving for a little the old Minute Book, which unfortunately is mutilated about this date, and has now no entries from 1675 to 1683, I find in the Rawdon Papers, under date June 26, 1679, a letter from the Duke of Ormond to Sir George Rawdon, which throws some light on the state of matters at that period in the neighbourhood of Broadisland. It will be remembered that 1679, was the year of the insurrection of the Scots Covenanters in the West, and of their defeat at Bothwell-bridge. Some of the routed party appear to have fled for safety to the coast of Antrim, where they do not seem to have met with very hospitable reception at the hands of those of the inhabitants of that district who were prelatically inclined. The Lord Lieutenant writes thus to his correspondent in Ulster:—

"I have now just received yours of the 26th, with the enclosed intelligence from Mr. Dobbs (of Castle Dobbs, near Carrickfergus). The defeat of the rebels is the more probable, for the suspicious coming over of those now mentioned by him, of which Kelso is one that, if he will, can give as good an account of the affairs in Scotland as any man, as also of any correspondence betwixt those rebels and their brethren here, and I take him to be the man sent you by Mr. Dobbs to examine; but whoever he is, I do not doubt

but you will examine him with dexterity, and keep him safe and close. I fear the company I ordered to march to Carrickfergus have not yet got thither; I have, therefore, ordered my Lord Mount-Alexander to send a part of his troops to the Larne and creeks next him."—(*Rawdon Papers*, 262.)

Returning to the old Minute Book, which here again becomes available, I make the following extracts:—

"AT TEMPLEPATRICK, February, 1688. Mr. Haltridge and the Clerk to go to Broadisland, and take account of Mr. Robert Cunningham's maintenance, and make report to the next meeting.

"AT BELFAST, April 3, 1688. Mr. J. Haltridge and the Clerk went thither (to Broadisland) and inquired about Mr. Robert Cunningham's maintenance, but the people were not ripe to make any particular report till next meeting, at which time it will be expected.

"AT TEMPLEPATRICK, June 5, 1688. Mr. Haltridge reports that he was there (at Broadisland), and that the Laird of Duntreath (Edmonstone) sheweth by a letter to Mr. Henry (of Carrickfergus) that the people were now very poor, but if trading come in he will be as active as may be, in stirring up the people; and as for himself, he promises to do what he did for Mr. Pitcairn, in Ballymena.* The meeting, considering the discouragements of Mr. Robert Cunningham, in matter of maintenance and dwelling-house, appoints Mr. Adair and Mr. Hall to deal as effectually as may be with the Laird, and report to next meeting.

"AT LISBURN, July 3, 1688. The former meetings' appointment about Broadisland is renewed, that on advertisement by Robert Cunningham, Mr. Patrick Adair write to the Laird of Duntreath about Mr. Cunningham's maintenance, and report to next meeting.

"AT TEMPLEPATRICK, August 7, 1688. The business of Broadisland deferred till Mr. Robert Cunningham move further in it.

"AT BELFAST, October 1, 1688. Mr. Patrick Adair, Mr. Hall, and the clerk are appointed to speak to the Laird of Duntreath about Mr. Robert Cunningham's maintenance, and make report at next meeting.

"AT BELFAST, November 6, 1688. Mr. Patrick Adair, Mr. Hall, and the Clerk went to the Laird of Duntreath. He promised to come with a fair account with Mr. Robert Cunningham, immediately after the communion, after which he will both allow a yearly competency for himself, and endeavour with the tenants for time past and future.

"AT BELFAST, Feb. 5, 1689. The meeting appoints Mr. John Haltridge, Mr. Hall, and the Clerk to repair to Broadisland, and deal in that affair, and report.

"AT BELFAST, March 5, 1689. No account of that affair, Messrs. Hall and Haltridge being absent."

* This connexion of the Edmonstones with Ballymena arose from their inter-marriages, which were frequent, with the Adair family, who were the owners of the Ballymena Estate, and were also Presbyterians.

The foregoing will explain the following, being the last extract which I shall make respecting Mr. Cunningham :—

“AT TEMPLEPATRICK, August 5, 1690. John Boyd (of Larne) hath got his charity, except from Mr. Robert Cunningham. The meeting appoints Mr. C. to give it him.”

I fear, from the way in which he was treated by his people, Mr. C. had sufficient occupation for his charity at home ; but he subsequently paid John Boyd, of Larne, as reported September 24, 1690.

During the wars in Ireland in 1688 and 1689, Mr. Cunningham seems to have been one of the very few Presbyterian ministers in Ulster who stood their ground, and did not retire to Scotland. His name appears on the list of Presbyterian ministers, as furnished in March, 1689, to the General Assembly in Scotland, and given by Reid in the appendix to his second volume, but it has not opposite to it the mark indicating that he was supposed to be in Scotland. I do not know that I have anything further to add with respect to this minister of Ballycarry, except to state, that if he was of a vindictive disposition, he must have been gratified in the year 1694, by hearing that his successor in the Prebend of Kilroot, Rev. William Milne, who was also a recreant Presbyterian minister, was, at a royal visitation of the Diocese of Down and Connor, held in that year at Lisburn, deprived of his office for “intemperance, incontinency of life; and neglect of his cures;” and that if he was fond of having a vindictive man as his neighbour, he must have rejoiced at the appointment of Milne’s successor, who was no less a man than Jonathan Swift, afterwards Dean of St. Patrick’s, whose presentation to Kilroot was dated in the year 1695, and who held that preferment for about five years. Mr. Cunningham died in 1697.* He was interred in the old churchyard of Ballycarry, where a grave is pointed out as his, which is covered with a plain slab of free-stone, but without any inscription to denote who sleeps beneath. The stone is now sunk to a level with the ground. Descendants he of course left none, being a bachelor ; and no one seems even to have taken the trouble of inscribing his name upon his tombstone.

* See Reid ii., pp. 125, 209, 272, 352, 357, 383, 402. M’Skimin’s Carrickfergus, p. 178. Rawdon Papers, p. 262.

III.—JAMES COBHAM. 1700-1759.—The settlement of Mr. Cobham in Broadisland took place in 1700, as appears from a casual entry in the Minutes of the Templepatrick Presbytery, under date January 15, 1760. Had it not been for this entry, we might not now have known the date of Mr. C.'s ordination. Congregational records, in the case of Ballycarry, of any kind, or for any period, I believe there are none. Presbyterian Minutes are also wanting from 1691 (the date of the last extant Minutes of "the Antrim Meeting") to 1745—the date of the first available Minutes of the Presbytery of Templepatrick,—thus leaving a chasm of more than fifty years. During this period, I have not met with anything of much importance, relative to Mr. Cobham or his congregation, in such books or manuscripts referring to those days as I have had it in my power to consult. All I can glean as bearing on our subject is the following:—In 1704 the name of Archibald Edmonston, of Red-Hall, in Broadisland, appears, in conjunction with those of other leading Presbyterian gentlemen of that day, prefixed to a petition to the House of Commons against the Sacramental Test Clause in the Act to prevent the further growth of Popery, which petition was not very favourably received by the House. In 1711 Mr. Cobham's own name appears in a somewhat singular connexion. On the 31st of March, in that year, eight women were tried for witchcraft at the Assizes of the County of Antrim, which were held in Carrickfergus. The particulars of the alleged offence are given by M'Skimin in his History of Carrickfergus, who also published the entire trial in the form of a pamphlet. Two of the supposed witches lived within the bounds of the Congregation of Ballycarry, and Mr. Cobham was one of three Presbyterian ministers who were examined as witnesses upon the trial. On behalf of the accused, it was found that they were mostly sober, industrious people, who attended public worship, could repeat the Lord's Prayer, and had been known to pray both in public and private, and that some of them had lately received the Communion; yet in spite of these disqualifications,—the force of which was admitted by Judge Upton, but denied by Judge Macartney,—witches the poor women were declared by

the Jury to be, and were sentenced to be imprisoned twelve months, and to stand four times in the pillory of Carrickfergus. I suppose this was the last trial for witchcraft which took place in this country.*

In 1724 took place in the Synod of Ulster the well-known trial of Dr. Nevin, of Downpatrick, for heresy. On the list of the ministers who did not join in the vote for the exclusion of Dr. Nevin (as given in the printed account of the trial) appears the name of James Cobham under the Belfast Presbytery; and "Colonel Brice," who was doubtless the Elder from Broadisland, is mentioned amongst the persons who protested against that measure. In 1726, the Non-Subscribing ministers were ejected from the Synod of Ulster, and formed themselves into the Presbytery of Antrim. The printed records of this occurrence omit (apparently with design) nearly all mention of names, so that I cannot trace how Broadisland Congregation or its minister behaved at this trying period. But they certainly were not amongst the original founders of the Antrim Presbytery.

We may now go on to the earliest extant Minutes of the Presbytery of Templepatrick, in 1745, with which body the Congregation of Broadisland was then connected. On the roll of the first meeting recorded in these Minutes, which was held in Templepatrick, August 27, 1745, occurs the name of James Cobham; but I do not find any entry bearing on congregational matters in Broadisland until we come to—

"LAIRNE, February 22, 1757. From Broadisland appeared Robert Symmenton and John Moore, Commissioners, supplicating that the Presbytery would take into their consideration the conduct of the Session and Congregation of Carrickfergus, who admit the people of Kilroot (a district midway between Broadisland and Carrickfergus) to membership and privileges without having certificates from Broadisland Session. The Commissioners observed that they did not blame Mr. Fullerton (the Minister of Carrickfergus), but his Session, for this irregular practice; and they informed the Presbytery that if the Congregation of Carrickfergus would give up the people about Loughmorne (another district bordering on Broadisland in the interior) to whom it was more convenient to worship in Ballycarry than at Carrickfergus, they were satisfied that the people of Kilroot should become members of Carrickfergus Congregation, if they chused that. The Presbytery

* M'Skimin's Carrickfergus, pp. 72—74.

considered the supplication from Broadisland, and are disposed to do everything in their power to preserve good order in all the Congregations in their bounds, and therefore appointed their Clerk to inform the Session and Congregation at Carrickfergus of the complaint from Broadisland, and the proposal made to exchange the people of Kilroot (if they be satisfied) for the people at Loughmorne; and the people of Kilroot and Loughmorne to be consulted by the Sessions of Broadisland and Carrickfergus about the proposed exchange; and the Presbytery will meet at Carrickfergus the first Tuesday in May next, to issue this matter, when all parties are requested to attend.

“CARRICKFERGUS, May 3, 1757. Inquiry was made if the Sessions of Broadisland and Carrickfergus had consulted the people of Kilroot and Loughmorne about an exchange proposed at the last meeting by the people of Broadisland; and it appeared that nothing had been done in that matter; nor are there any Commissioners from Broadisland here at this meeting. The Presbytery, therefore, could not do anything in the affair at this time.”

Nor do I think that the proposed singular “exchange” was ever effected.

The next notices that I meet with respecting the Ballycarry Congregation are somewhat curious.

“BALLYCARRY, December 13, 1757. Mr. Rogers, as appointed, wrote to the Congregation of Broadisland, to state their accounts with Mr. Cobham. The Congregation were asked if they had appointed any Commissioners to give an account of their affairs to the Presbytery, and Robert Symmenton, Samuel M'Dowell, and John Clark appeared as Commissioners. Robert Symmenton informed the Presbytery, that at All Saints, 1756, Mr. Edmunstone's tenants owed £4 6s. 9d., and of the year 1757, they had paid £2 10s. 1d. Samuel M'Dowell said, that the people, in that part of the parish called Kilroot, had not stated their accounts with Mr. Cobham, and assigned for a reason that there was an account between Mr. Brice (their landlord) and Mr. Cobham, whereby it appeared that Mr. Cobham had received in barley the value of £8 19s.; this sum was received by four bushels of barley annually for fourteen years preceding November, 1755. Mr. Cobham refused to allow anything for said barley, as it was ordered to be paid to him by old Mr. Brice, in his life-time, and continued by Mrs. Bryce during her life, out of her own jointure. No account from Dobbsland. John Clark said there was no stated account with the people of Magheramorne (two districts of Broadisland Congregation). The Presbytery observed that the state of Broadisland Congregation is very confused, and recommended it very warmly to that people to use diligence in raising the arrear stipend, and to have their accounts stated.”

“CARRICKFERGUS, Feb. 7, 1758. Mr. Fullerton informed this Presbytery (Mr. Cobham was not present) that he had a conversation with Mr. Brice concerning the £8 19s mentioned by Samuel M'Dowell at the last meeting as charged in Mr. Cobham's stipend

for barley given him by Mr. Brice's tenants, and that Mr. Brice told him that said barley would not be charged, for that he had reason to believe that it was ordered by his father, and afterwards by his mother, to be given Mr. Cobham as a gift, and that he intended to continue it as such."

"BALLYCARRY, August 15, 1758. Mr. Cobham preached from Psalm lxiii. 1, which was considered and approved. From Broadisland appeared Archibald Edmunstone, Esq., and Alexander Gillespy, representatives of the Congregation; and from the Session of Broadisland appeared James Symmenton and Samuel M'Dowell. These representatives of the Congregation and Session of Broadisland were asked if Mr. Cobham performed the duties of his office to the satisfaction of his Congregation. They answered that he was very faithful and diligent in the execution of his office, and that his Congregation were well pleased with him. The Presbytery inquired if the conduct of the Session was agreeable to the Congregation. Alexander Gillespy answered that he heard nothing to the contrary. It was next inquired at Mr. Cobham how his Session and Congregation behaved towards him and one another. He answered that his Session were few in number, but that they were men of sober lives, and regular in the performance of the duties of their station, and said that he hoped that they and the rest of his Congregation were making proficiency in knowledge and virtue. Mr. Cobham referred the Presbytery for an account of the stipend to Robert Symmenton, Samuel M'Dowell, and Alexander Gillespy, who informed the Presbytery that Mr. Edmunstone and his tenants had a full discharge for seventeen pounds annually from Mr. Cobham until now, 1757; and that Magheramorne, Dobbsland, Ballyhill, and Kilroot, had not stated their accounts, nor lessened the arrear formerly given in upon them. The Presbytery observed that these last-mentioned divisions of Broadisland Congregation have not been diligent enough in fixing their accounts, and recommended it warmly to the people from these parts of the Congregation that they would put their affairs into a more regular situation, and that they should choose a Committee for setting and regulating their seats in the meeting-house, and the Presbytery will be ready to assist them if desired."

Mr. Cobham was soon to be freed from all troubles about stipend or anything else, for under date—

"LAIRNE, March 10, 1759. The Presbytery received information that the Rev. James Cobham died February 22, 1759, and that his Congregation was to be supplied until May next, by ministers he had engaged for that purpose."

In Ballycarry graveyard is a headstone with the following inscription:—"Sacred to the memory of Mary Craig, who departed this life 30th October, 1825, aged 75 years; also her father, James Cobham, and her grandfather, Rev. James Cobham, above fifty years minister of Ballycarry." Immediately adjoining this headstone is a free-

stone slab on which is engraved a coat of arms, but no inscription, and this is believed to indicate the grave of the third minister of Ballycarry. As to Mr. Cobham's descendants, the reader will hear something in the subsequent part of this narrative about his son and namesake, Mr. James Cobham, whose children (being also the minister's grandchildren) married into the families of some of the neighbouring farmers, and their posterity cannot now be easily traced. The name of Cobham is not, I believe, to be now found in the neighbourhood of Ballycarry.

(To be continued.)

THOUGHTS ON THE RESURRECTION.

As to immortality nature is voiceless, and man the prey of ceaseless doubt, except through Divine Revelation. This statement is confirmed by the history of human belief and experience. Where, out of the pale of revealed religion, can we find an instance of firm, sufficient, satisfying faith in immortality,—of a faith strong enough to sustain the soul in its seasons of the severest need, and to give it triumph in death? I know not a single instance. The dying Socrates made the nearest approach to such a faith; but between a Christian death-scene and his there is a heaven-wide contrast. “I have strong hope,” said he, “that I am now going to the company of good men; but on a matter encompassed with so much doubt it becomes us not to be too confident.” What term of comparison is there between such a timid, hesitating hope, and the full, clear faith of the believer in Christ, whose whole soul goes forth in the glad declaration,—“I know that my Redeemer liveth, and that his disciple cannot die”? The most striking characteristic of the Christian's death is the more than faith, the confidence that will not entertain a doubt, the almost unveiled vision of the life to come, that plays before the eyes just closing upon earthly scenes. I have spoken of the greatest and most revered of the ancient philosophers; and often has his image come up before me in the chambers of penury, and by the death-bed of the lowly, and unlettered except in the word of God, and constrained

me to say to myself,—“Surely, the least in the kingdom of heaven is greater than he.”

There were others of those old philosophers who spoke fearlessly of death. But how? By bracing themselves up to look steadily and with flinty face at the dread alternative of annihilation. To prove that annihilation is no evil is the object of full half of Cicero's celebrated treatise on immortality; and Seneca, who talks more than any of the ancients about the contempt of death, manifestly leans towards the belief that death is the end of all things. Nor have I ever known or read of a happy and hopeful death anywhere in Christendom among those who could not fix the eye of faith upon the risen Redeemer. Avowed deists have sunk into their last sleep, sometimes in brutish indifference, sometimes in indescribable agony of soul. Those of our own day and country, who, though claiming to be called Christians, deny the resurrection, yet live; and may God grant them a better mind and a less icy creed, before the chill of death creeps over them!

Our need of the Saviour's resurrection as a support for our faith in immortality may appear from considering the times when we most need this faith. They are not seasons when the intellectual powers are in the fullest activity, so as to permit us to take in a wide range of thought, and gather in from the expanse of nature or the phenomena of life arguments or illustrations for our faith. But a fact, an example, the mind can always apprehend; and it appeals also to the imagination,—a faculty which never slumbers, and is often most active and vivid when the reasoning powers are the least so. When the mind is overwhelmed by some sudden stroke of bereavement, or is intent on the passing death-scene of one tenderly beloved, or is distracted by the pains and infirmities of acute and fatal illness, it cannot ransack heaven and earth for assurances of immortality; and yet it needs something above and beyond itself, on which to fix its steadfast regards of trust and hope. And at such a season, while even distinct self-consciousness seems suspended, and there is no ear for the myriads of voices from the outward world, nor even for the tenderest human comforter who speaks of earthly things, the soul

can look to the Saviour's forsaken sepulchre, can see the burial garments drop from his reanimated form, and can hear as from the very lips of the Redeemer, as the angel rolls the stone away,—“He that believeth in me shall never die.”

A. P. PEABODY.

WHAT THE SCRIPTURES TEACH.—No. 3.

WHILE the Scriptures teach that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and not God the Son, they make frequent reference to his death, and the blessings which it is intended to bring to mankind. It is an evidence of God's love to the world. “God commended his love toward us in that while we were yet sinners Christ died for us.”—Romans v. 8. So it is also an evidence of Christ's love. He carried out the purposes of God, and was “one” with him in the great work of human redemption. “I am the good shepherd: the good shepherd giveth his life for the sheep.”—John x. 11. “Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends.”—John xv. 13. The Scriptures teach that Christ died to bring us to God, and to reconcile us to him. “Christ hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God.”—1 Pet. iii. 18. “You that were sometimes alienated and enemies in your mind by wicked works, yet now hath he reconciled in the body of his flesh through death.”—Col. i. 21. He died to redeem men from iniquity. “Who gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works.”—Titus ii. 14. “In whom we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins.”—Col. i. 14.

The Scriptures do not teach that Christ died for a chosen few, but, on the contrary, they very plainly declare that he died for all. “He is the propitiation for our sins: and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world.”—1 John ii. 2. “Behold the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world.”—John i. 29. Neither do they teach that he died to satisfy the justice or to appease the anger of God; but they distinctly teach that his mission and death were God's beneficent appointments

for the salvation of men. "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself."—2 Cor. v. 19. "Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood."—Rom. iii. 25. The Scriptures represent Christ's sufferings as a powerful motive to holiness of life. "He died for all, that they which live should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto him which died for them and rose again."—2 Cor. v. 15. "Ye are bought with a price, therefore glorify God in your body and in your spirit which are God's."—1 Cor. vi. 20. Christ by dying for mankind was raised to higher glory. "Who for the joy that was set before him endured the cross, despising the shame, and is set down at the right hand of the throne of God."—Heb. xii. 2. "Worthy is the Lamb that was slain, to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honour, and glory, and blessing."—Rev. v. 12.

THE REV. R. CLELAND'S STATEMENT OF RELIGIOUS BELIEF,

MADE ON THE OCCASION OF HIS ORDINATION AT CARRICKFERGUS,
ON DECEMBER 30, 1862.

I GLADLY embrace the opportunity which this solemn occasion offers me, of briefly stating the views which, as a Christian, I hold; nor will it at all interfere with the dictates of my conscience to make an open profession of my belief, for I am neither ashamed nor afraid publicly to profess the principles upon which my faith is founded.

The Bible I regard as emphatically the Book of God. I believe it contains a faithful account of the successive revelations which the Creator has given of himself to mankind. It opens to our view the treasures of divine beneficence and compassion; it reveals to us a loving God proclaiming, through a loving Saviour, the glad tidings of salvation to a sinful world.

I believe that there is one God—that he is infinite, eternal, and unchangeable in his being, wisdom, power, holiness, justice, goodness, truth,—in all the glorious attributes that adorn his nature. I believe that he is self-existent and Almighty, deriving his power from no other being, and depending upon no other for assistance in his government and administration; that he is omniscient—that he is acquainted with the thoughts and the imaginations of the hearts of men—that all things are known to him—that he sees the end from the beginning. I believe that he is the Origin—the Great First Cause of all things—that he is the Author and Governor of the Universe—that "in the beginning he created the heavens and the earth, and all the host of them"—that he graciously provides

for the wants of all his creatures—that he is infinitely good, creating that he might bless, and ever blessing the creatures that he has formed—that he is our Father in heaven, and that from him “cometh down every good and perfect gift.”

I believe that this Almighty Being—the Origin and First Cause of all things—is *One*, strictly and numerically one,—absolutely and perfectly one; one essence, one nature, one being; that he has no rival on his throne or equal in his administration; that the first of all the commandments is—“Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord;” that he was revealed to our first parents, to the Patriarchs, and Prophets as one; and lastly, that Jesus Christ and his Apostles taught the same truth, that God is one; and that the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ is the only true God. I believe that, as God is one, he is the only proper object of religious worship; that it injures Christianity to present to the worshipper more than one being to be adored; that to address a duality or Trinity of persons in the Godhead has a tendency to confuse the mind and distract the attention from the only proper object of religious worship. I therefore reject the doctrine of the Trinity, as not only unscriptural but as altogether opposed to the teachings of Scripture, to the revelations of nature, and to the dictates of sound judgment.

While I believe that there is one God, I equally believe that there is “one Mediator between God and man;” that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, and the Saviour of the world; that he came out from the Father “in the fulness of the time, made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons.” I believe that Jesus spoke and taught with divine power and authority; that he demonstrated the truth of his mission by miracles so clear and convincing that, in the words of Nicodemus, “No man can do these miracles that thou doest except God be with him.” I cannot, however, believe that the Son is God; or that he is equal with his own eternal Father, because he himself declares that his Father is greater than he; and again, that his Father is greater than all. Neither can I believe that he suffered as a substitute in our room and stead, or that by his sufferings he appeased the wrath and satisfied the justice of God; because such doctrine is not only not contained in Scripture, but, as it appears to me, is totally opposed to the teachings of Scripture; because, moreover, it impeaches the justice of God, and robs him of his mercy and free grace. The object of his mission, I believe, originated in the free, unpurchased, and unpurchasable mercy of God, who “so loved the world that he gave his only-begotten Son that whosoever believeth in him should not perish but have everlasting life;” that in Christ we see God reconciling the world unto himself, and that through him all men, if they will, have free access to the Father. I believe that Jesus Christ taught the doctrine of repentance and regeneration, and that this is the sole ground of our acceptance; that if we forsake our sins, “God is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness.” The doctrine of repentance, as the ground of our acceptance, our Lord has fully confirmed, for the great aim of his teaching was to make men pure and holy, and to prepare them for another and happier state of being. In order

to carry out this object, he exposed himself to a life of labours, dangers, and sufferings, he submitted to a painful and ignominious death, even the death of the cross; he rose again, and ascended into heaven, where he ever sitteth at "the right hand of God," making intercession for his people.

I believe also in the Holy Spirit—in that divine spirit or influence which God imparts to those who love and obey him; and which sanctifies, cheers, and elevates the human heart—that spirit which was given to our blessed Lord without measure, which, on the day of Pentecost, descended upon the apostles and disciples, and which God will vouchsafe to those who sincerely and earnestly ask for it.

DR. MONTGOMERY AND THE LATE REV. F. BLAKELY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CHRISTIAN UNITARIAN.

SIR,—In pursuance of the unpleasant task imposed upon me by Dr. Montgomery's attack upon the memory of the late Mr. Blakely, I proceed to discharge my duty, in as brief a manner as I can. When I have done, the reader will see that it is not in the slightest degree affected by the unfounded and uncharitable charges of Dr. Montgomery.

First,—Dr. Montgomery says, "A story was invented that I had frequently stood in the way of his (Mr. Blakely's) interests, and acted unkindly towards him during his public life that this story was rapidly circulated over Ulster; and in Moneyrea particularly, three modest and amiable personages took it up, carried it into every house, declaimed about it on the highways, and speedily prepared the Congregation to leave the Synod." When in Ireland lately, I did not canvass the Province of Ulster to test the accuracy of Dr. Montgomery's statement; but application was made to nearly 100 members of the Moneyrea Congregation, and *not one of them ever heard of such a story till after its publication in the Christian Unitarian*. I call, then, upon Dr. Montgomery to give us the names of these amiable personages who circulated the story, and to prove his assertions by unimpeachable evidence. It will probably turn out that the story was invented, as affording a plausible pretext for dragging "pecuniary transactions" and "rendered services" before the world—matters which had no natural or logical connexion with the charges preferred against Dr. Montgomery in *The Non-Subscriber*, and which his famous letter was written, as he alleges, to refute.

Second,—Dr. Montgomery says, "that whilst he (Mr. Blakely) is now perpetually held up by his crafty eulogists, 'as the consistent friend of religious liberty,' he had *twice* subscribed the General Synod's *formula* recognizing the Westminster Confession of Faith; but I soon discovered that he went far beyond me in his Unitarianism, being a decided Humanitarian."

Here *hypocrisy* in religious profession is attributed to Mr. Blakely. If the expressions in this extract mean anything at all, they are intended to convey the idea to the public, that while Mr.

Blakely was a Humanitarian at heart, with his hand he subscribed a formula which recognized Christ as God, and a number of other doctrines equally irrational and unscriptural.

The facts of the case are simple, when truthfully stated, and will place Dr. Montgomery in a position before the public which few would like to occupy.

The General Synod, at the time referred to, was composed of fourteen Presbyteries. Ten of these required, as Dr. Montgomery states in his "Outlines," no subscription of any kind, while the remaining four had adopted what was called the pacific act, that is, a law authorizing subscription with an explanation. Mr. Blakely was licensed by one of these four Presbyteries, and ordained by another; and it is therefore probable he did sign the formula twice: but this act, as Dr. Montgomery is well aware, did not imply belief in the Confession of Faith, *except so far only as it was agreeable to the Word of God*. Wherein, then, consisted Mr. Blakely's hypocrisy? Could not any one sign, on such terms, any creed that ever was invented by Pagan or Turk, Jew or Christian? Dr. Montgomery, at least, thought so not very long ago; for in his speech at Dromore, in 1844, he exclaims, "Why, on such terms I could sign the Koran of Mahomet. Only allow men to give their own explanation, and no creed would impose the slightest difficulty." Yet, in the face of these facts, Dr. Montgomery accuses Mr. Blakely of hypocrisy—facts which the *accuser must have known*, removed even the shadow of reproach or blame from the act of the accused. There was nothing in the transaction, as it actually occurred, to occasion him regret during life, or to justify reproach when in his grave. He commenced his ministry an honest and earnest supporter of religious liberty, and throughout his entire public life he was its fearless and consistent advocate. Will Dr. Montgomery reconcile his own statements at Dromore and elsewhere with his late charge of hypocrisy against Mr. Blakely? *One or other must be false, and they are both made by himself*. Dr. Montgomery's statements at Dromore are indisputably true. The signing of the formula, therefore, involved no insincerity on Mr. Blakely's part, and Dr. Montgomery has knowingly slandered the memory of his old friend.

Third,—Dr. Montgomery tells us that in the year 1835 he got up a subscription for Mr. Blakely, that ultimately reached the large sum of £213. Does Dr. Montgomery forget what Mr. Blakely did for him in this respect, and that not once but several times? On one occasion, particularly, did not my father-in-law work almost night and day, collecting subscriptions for Dr. Montgomery? Did he not, *at his own expense*, visit several towns in the Counties of Antrim and Down, canvass many of our Unitarian Congregations, and earn for himself much abuse and ill-will in getting up a testimonial for his friend? In fact, every one intimately acquainted with the two men knows that, if a correct balance was struck between them for services thus rendered, when Mr. Blakely died, Dr. Montgomery was in his debt, and that the ingratitude, therefore, is on the part of the living, and not on that of the dead.

Fourth,—Dr. Montgomery has paraded before the public his services to David Blakely, and, as in the father's case, he has ex-

aggregated them beyond all due dimensions. He says, "David Blakely entered college at a very early age." This is not the fact; for he did not go to college till his brother William, who was two years his junior, had completed his preparatory education, and had passed with credit his college entrance examinations. But Dr. Montgomery's object here, as well as where he tells us that "David Blakely was little more than a boy when he took him into his school at the highest usher's salary," is abundantly evident. He wishes, from the exaggeration of the simplest facts, to represent an obligation where no particular obligation existed, and to have the public set down to an act of disinterested generosity, what was, to a very great extent, an act of necessity.

The facts of the case are these—David Blakely was from 18 to 20 years of age (a rather antiquated boy) when he entered Dr. Montgomery's school. He had received an excellent preparatory education, from a man famous for his careful and painstaking supervision of his pupils, and was therefore *qualified* for the situation of usher. When Dr. Montgomery required an assistant, he found him in the son of his old friend. And "so well did he discharge his duties in this situation" that when Dr. Montgomery was *obliged* to have a resident assistant, David Blakely had the appointment. But there is no *uncommon* obligation conferred upon D. Blakely in all this. He was qualified for the situation and he received the salary Dr. Montgomery would have had to pay some other, and perhaps less suitable, man. The whole was a purely business arrangement of cash paid for services rendered.

Moreover, when David Blakely first entered Dr. Montgomery's school as assistant, he was like other students living in lodgings, boarding humbly, and attending his college classes—and Dr. Montgomery gave him *sixteen pounds* per annum for his services. And when he became full day-assistant, teaching from 8 o'clock A.M. till 3 o'clock P.M., and still living in lodgings and boarding humbly, Dr. Montgomery paid him, I believe, £30 per annum. Few people will think that D. Blakely's services were overpaid, and the credit of *enriching* himself, if he did grow rich, must be attributed more to his own economy than Dr. Montgomery's generosity.

I have no means of testing Dr. Montgomery's statements relative to other services rendered to D. Blakely. If the whole truth were known, I have no doubt a trumpet of far smaller dimensions would have been sufficient to announce the obligation.

With regard to the clerkship little need be said. It would have been strange, indeed, if Dr. Montgomery had swallowed up all the Government grants, and not have allowed even one of the smallest of those sugar plums to fall now and then in the way of his poorer brethren. He did not, however, as he asserts, reject £50 per annum for life to enrich Mr. Blakely and other members of the Remonstrant Synod, and for the best of all reasons,—such an offer was never made to him. A member of Synod, and particular friend, may have talked of proposing that Dr. Montgomery should have the clerkship, and I know Mr. Glendy did; but, as Dr. Montgomery himself very well knows, there is no evidence whatever to shew that the Synod,—the only body who had the power of making the

appointment,—ever entertained the idea of conferring the honour upon him. Consequently, Dr. Montgomery never made the alleged self-sacrifice. He never rejected £50 per annum to benefit Mr. Blakely, or any one else.

The following extract from *The Non-Subscriber* of February last will place Dr. Montgomery's benevolence, in this matter, in a clear and intelligible light:—"We can tell the public, what the Doctor omitted to do, that the £50 per annum, which he represents as having so generously declined to appropriate to himself, he durst not touch, for, as agent for the distribution of the Royal Bounty, he could not hold the office of clerk of Synod. He may make his election to either, but he cannot hold both offices, and thus this magnanimous act of self-denial becomes little less than a transparent misrepresentation."

I come now to that part of Dr. Montgomery's letter, where he says, "Distressing as my enforced task has hitherto been, I must yet enter upon details still more painful." No doubt Dr. Montgomery felt as he here states. To most men it would be an ungrateful task to be compelled to divulge *facts* that would necessarily take away a *neighbour's* good name and character. And, therefore, if possessed of any sensibility at all, I cannot conceive how Dr. Montgomery could attempt to blast the reputation of his *friend*, Mr. Blakely, by *unfounded charges* of fraud and ingratitude, without being somewhat distressed; or how he could enter upon his next, and final indictment, without still more pain: for in the history of human friendship, probably nothing has ever occurred more malignant in design, or more uncharitable in execution.

It was not enough for Dr. Montgomery to asperse Mr. Blakely's character, by imputing to him dishonesty, ingratitude, and hypocrisy. He proceeds to represent him as imbecile in mind—morbid and irritable in temper—as a man who had lost all self-control, and whose moral faculties even were deranged. And after thus representing his friend as mentally weak and morally irresponsible, he goes on to ascribe to him acts which he never committed, and which never had any actual existence.

To dispose, then, once for all, of Mr. Blakely's mental and moral imbecility, I now give the testimony of two of his medical attendants.

"DEAR SIR,—You ask me if the account given by Dr. Montgomery, in the January number of *The Christian Unitarian*, of the state of the late Mr. Blakely's faculties is correct. *I reply, that I consider it is not.* Mr. Blakely's memory was not so good as it had been, but his intellectual and moral faculties, in my mind, were not impaired or in a morbid condition. On these points I can express my opinion with considerable confidence, as I was Mr. Blakely's medical adviser for four years previous to his departure from Ireland, and had frequent opportunities of seeing him and conversing with him.

"*Comber, Feb. 9th, 1863.*"

"JAMES FRAME, Surgeon.

"DEAR SIR,—I had many opportunities, both in Ireland and England, of forming a judgment of the late Rev. F. Blakely's *intellectual* faculties, which I considered *perfectly sound*, until within a few days of his death. Moreover, I considered that if the *moral faculties* of

some of his brethren had been in the same healthy state, our Church in Ireland would have escaped the infliction of the miserable squabbles that have disgraced it. Dr. Montgomery's statements in *The Christian Unitarian*, with regard to Mr. Blakely's state of mind, are not true.—Yours sincerely,

"Saintfield, Feb. 2nd, 1863."

"WM. GORDON, M.D.

Should further evidence be required on this point, I have it at hand, in the letters of other medical gentlemen, which is as clear, decided, and unequivocal as that already given. What, then, becomes of Dr. Montgomery's repeated but unfounded assertions! It would be a point gained, if Mr. Blakely's character could be blackened, even by acts resulting from impaired mental power, and moral discrimination: but I will not allow Dr. Montgomery to make this false statement, and then build upon it a series of alleged acts, "which, on any other ground, would imprint the indelible stain of injustice and ingratitude upon his memory." I impugn, therefore, the truth both of the accusation itself, and its alleged consequences, and call upon Dr. Montgomery to substantiate his allegations, or acknowledge himself guilty of voluntary and unprovoked slander.

That my father-in-law was weak in body I freely admit. Most people are, in the evening of life, when worn out by age and incessant labour. But that he was weak in mind, or incapable of judging between right and wrong, is a fiction as gross as ever fell from the pen of him who first wrote it down. On this head there is abundance of confirmatory evidence to refute the single and unsupported assertion of Dr. Montgomery, who saw Mr. Blakely but once during the last four or five years of his life, and then at a time when he was so ill, that I was written for to go to Ireland, to be present "when the last sad scene of all" was supposed to be at hand. On what authority, then, can Dr. Montgomery assert that Mr. Blakely's mental faculties were so impaired, that he was little better than a helpless imbecile; and his moral faculties so deranged as to render him unaccountable for his deeds? Nothing more outrageously untrue was ever conceived or published, and it deserves the unqualified reprobation of every upright, honest man in the community.

But Dr. Montgomery informs "the world" that this mental and moral imbecility, when influenced by the misrepresentations of unscrupulous men, bore certain fruits.—What are these?

First,—Mr. Blakely is accused of "railing" against Dr. Montgomery as his "deadliest foe." Now, it is to be remembered that Dr. Montgomery "did not obtrude his presence" upon Mr. Blakely, probably more than once during the last four or five years of his life, and then the scene was characterized by "penitence" and "forgiveness" and the hearts and spirits of the two were one again, and both were happy. There was no railing here, and therefore Dr. Montgomery's accusation cannot rest on personal knowledge. Is it then a pure invention of Dr. Montgomery's own, or has he founded it on the loose and indiscriminating reports of his Moneyrea agents? On whatever authority the statement is made, it is untrue. The Rev. John M'Caw, who of all Mr. Blakely's brother ministers, visited him most frequently, and spent most time

with him, writes me to say, that in his hearing a sentence never passed Mr. Blakely's lips, that even the most jealous of Dr. Montgomery's honour could justly deem derogatory thereto. During the latter years of his life, I had myself frequent opportunities of learning Mr. Blakely's sentiments towards Dr. Montgomery: but in my presence he never uttered one ungenerous word of his early friend. Even when he was compelled to disapprove of the course pursued by Dr. Montgomery, and to condemn the language used by him, insinuating infidelity and hypocrisy to his brother ministers, even then no harsh or unkind sentiment escaped his lips. When he saw the Synod he was so active in establishing, and the interests of which he was so anxious to promote, about to be rent in sunder by the imposition of tests that could neither make men good Christians who were already in it, nor exclude bad men and hypocrites from gaining admission, he was mortified beyond expression: but he never assailed Dr. Montgomery's character. His severest judgments were regrets uttered in a spirit of the purest kindness and affection.

Second,—Dr. Montgomery asserts that Mr. Blakely's house became a rendezvous for the young aspirants who forgot his services, or meanly envied his position in the Christian Church and the world. This accusation is, like its predecessors, without any foundation in fact. I pass it by with a simple contradiction—a contradiction founded on the best authority, viz., that of those who were frequent visitors at his house, and especially of Miss M'Kittrick, who lived in his house, managed his domestic affairs, knew all his visitors, and usually heard their general conversation. She and others all testify that for this assertion of Dr. Montgomery's there is no foundation in fact.

But Dr. Montgomery gives us the following proof of his statement. Speaking of my father-in-law, he says, "On one occasion, his favourite elder (who had been invited to take tea), after listening for a long time to virulent abuse of me in Mr. Blakely's presence, rose and called upon his wife to go home. 'What!' exclaimed my old friend, 'will you not wait for your tea, David?' 'No,' replied the worthy man; 'I thought it was for that purpose I was invited, but I now find it was only to hear Dr. Montgomery abused.'"

Now, this story, so graphically and characteristically told, has the great drawback which attends so many of Dr. Montgomery's other assertions. It also is untrue. The sitting-room in which the above scene is represented as having taken place is comparatively small, and was filled with guests on the occasion referred to. In addition to Mr. Blakely and Miss M'Kittrick, eight others were present. Of these, Mr. Blakely is dead; Mrs. David Orr I have not consulted; but of the remaining eight, seven declare they have no remembrance of such an occurrence. Now, in a room so small, the scene as described, could not, by *any possibility*, have taken place without all present being cognizant of it. Nor would a scene so extraordinary in its character be at all likely to pass soon from the memory and be forgotten. Since seven, then, out of the guests present have no recollection of the occurrence, it is pretty evident it never had existence but in the imagination of its author.

The following letter will be conclusive on this point. Before introducing it, however, it is necessary to say that, soon after Dr. Montgomery's letter appeared, Mr. David Orr was written to, and in his reply states that the Rev. John Orr was the man who had abused Dr. Montgomery on the occasion referred to. An extract from this letter I forwarded to the Rev. John Orr, and here is his reply.

"DEAR SIR,—From the extract you enclose it appears that Mr. David Orr accuses me of being the person who abused Dr. Montgomery in the house of the late Mr. Blakely on the famous occasion when he threatened to leave. On this subject my reply, as you request, shall be short. I never abused Dr. Montgomery in all my life: criticised certain portions of his public policy, I have, again and again. I may, therefore, have spoken in Mr. Blakely's presence in condemnation of certain public acts of the Doctor's; but I never abused his character, never spoke of him as despised, either in Mr. Blakely's presence or out of it.

"With regard to the occasion when Mr. David Orr made the great demonstration of his zeal, all I have to say is, *I do not remember it at all*. I do not remember Mr. Orr ever rising in anger, in consequence of any opinion expressed either by me or by any one else. Nor do I remember Mr. Orr having ever threatened to leave Mr. Blakely's house in my presence. . . . The greater part of the story, I believe, is a hallucination; but even if all were perfectly true, it would be foolish to make any great noise about it, for every one who knows Mr. David Orr knows that his partisanship of Dr. Montgomery was of that indiscriminating character, that he could not bear any remarks unfavourable to the Doctor, whether they were fair or unfair.

"As to my alleged inconsistency in abusing the Doctor behind his back, while I pretended to be his friend before his face, I shall not condescend to say a word.—Ever yours,

"Comber, Feb. 9th, 1863."

"JOHN ORR.

Third,—I now leave the hallucination scene, and come to the next statement in Dr. Montgomery's letter. "The virtual derangement of his mental faculties, soon afterwards culminated in passing me, unsaluted and with a scowl of indignation, upon the streets of Belfast,—and sadder still, his son David followed his deluded father's example, passed me with scorn, and knew me no more." Dr. Montgomery has supplied me, in the following extract from his letter, with suitable language wherewith to reply truly to this charge. "A fiction so base in all its parts, as that just quoted, was, I firmly believe, never penned by mortal man. From beginning to end, like all other charges from the same source, it is absolutely untrue." Yes, it is absolutely untrue, for, at the time referred to, Mr. Blakely was not able to go to Belfast at all, and his son David had been four or five years in his grave. So reckless and unreliable is Dr. Montgomery in his statements, that he might well add, "that truth is stranger than fiction."

Fourth,—And now of the deeply affecting scene. That it is overdrawn no one can for a moment doubt. That Mr. Blakely may have shed tears on seeing his old friend is very probable: but that "he reprobated the conduct of certain young ministers, or asked pardon for the injuries he had been led to do Dr. Mont-

gomery, I don't believe; for he was not given to severity of censure, and especially in the absence of the censured, and having never, in thought, word, or deed injured his friend, tears of penitence were impossible. In a word, judging from the general untruthfulness of the assertions made by Dr. Montgomery in his extraordinary letter, perhaps, I would not be far wrong in setting down the entire story as a myth. Why this should be an exception to whole pages of embellished fiction, I see no reason for concluding.

I pass on, however, to what Dr. Montgomery denominates his "great crime." I rest my case on his own statement. He admits that a special messenger was sent to Dunmurry—that this messenger delivered a message, and announced an invitation, and that this invitation was not accepted. What, then, if the *cause* assigned in *The Non-Subscriber* for this conduct was not the right one, the conduct clearly was still the same, unfeeling and reprehensible. A messenger went to Dunmurry and delivered an invitation in these words, "Tell the Doctor, if he can find time to pay me a visit before I go, I will be glad to see him;"—an invitation, which in the most of cases, and with the most of men would have had all the force of a command: but no further notice was taken of it. "The strong inclination to bid Mr. Blakely farewell" belied its baptismal name, and somehow or other, that moral part of his nature, for which, Dr. Montgomery tells us, "he has so much reason to thank God, his ability and willingness to forgive," was thoroughly repressed by trifling and worldly engagements. Is it not astonishing, that a man, and a minister too, so richly endowed by nature with the "graces divine," could not find time during five days, to drive as many miles, to visit an old friend he was never to see again on this side the grave, and to sweeten, if but for an hour, with a little sympathy and kindness, his departure from his native land.

What heightens the offence in this case is, that Dr. Montgomery and Mr. Blakely were almost brothers. They had known each other from early manhood; they had fought side by side the battles of religious liberty; they had frequently sat at each other's tables; they had rejoiced with each other in the day of prosperity, and sympathised with each other in the night of trial. They had lived in the sweet interchange of a communion and friendship that promised to be as enduring as life; but, unfortunately, alienation sprung up, and the friends were disunited. In order that a life-friendship should not thus terminate, Mr. Blakely, a few days before he left Ireland, sent Mr. Orr to Dunmurry, and, among other things, told him to say, "Tell the Doctor that if he can find time, I will be glad to see him before I go." Look at Fletcher Blakely in his old arm-chair, with bowed head and body bent,—the image of debility,—and listen to him, with voice weak and tremulous, delivering that message of reconciliation and love. And then look upon the other of the two friends, and mark the cold formality of his reply—A minister cannot leave home on Saturday—an important engagement at the Asylum on Monday—a poor farmer's case at Lisburn on Tuesday; and, as it turned out, the only remaining day was likewise occupied with some urgent business. Consequently, Dr. Montgomery did not go at all. Had he gone, Mr. Blakely might again have wept tears upon his hand; but they

would not have been tears of penitence. They would have been tears of joy that a reconciliation had taken place—that the unpleasant past was forgotten, and that between them peace was again born, never to be broken. But this gratification was denied him; and the relentless and wretched man he left behind him, trampled upon his heart and affections, and thereby added more bitterness to his departure from Ireland, and, indeed, to the remaining months of his existence, than any other cause whatever.

Such is Dr. Montgomery's "great crime"—and greater never was committed, whether considered in the light of violated friendship, or as an outrage upon the sanctities of Christian charity.

But his *reasons* for not visiting Mr. Blakely on this occasion were *mere pretexts*. He had no idea of forgiving the "last offence;" for when he was in the immediate neighbourhood of Mr. Blakely's residence, he *refused* to call upon him. He gave a lecture in Moneyrea Meeting-house on a week evening, but a *very* short time before his old friend left Ireland—he was within fifteen minutes' drive of Spamount—and had plenty of time at his disposal; but again his ability and willingness to forgive were not equal to the occasion, and he did not call. At the conclusion of his lecture he shook hands with the lady who conducted Mr. Blakely's domestic affairs; but his "good old friend" was now forgotten. Moreover, Dr. Montgomery, during this visit, was the guest of Mr. David Orr, who, according to Mr. Orr's own statement, offered to drive his guest over to Mr. Blakely's, and even urged him to pay a visit; but this "last offence" still reigned supreme over the ability to forgive, and Mr. Orr's kind offer was not accepted. Nor was this all, for when Mr. Orr failed, did not a lady, who was supposed to have more influence with Dr. Montgomery, try her powers of persuasion, but all to no purpose? Dr. Montgomery would not visit Mr. Blakely. What then becomes of those heartless, shallow pretexts—a minister cannot leave home on Saturday—an important engagement at the asylum on Monday—a poor farmer's case at Lisburn on Tuesday; for Dr. Montgomery would not call to see Mr. Blakely when he was almost at his door!

I have now considered this matter as represented by himself; and if it were at all necessary I could strengthen my position by *proving* that the statement in *The Non-Subscriber* of May last was literally true, and that the only special message sent by Mr. Orr was an invitation to Dr. Montgomery to come and see Mr. Blakely before he would leave Ireland. But this is not necessary. Dr. Montgomery's own version of the story is as self-condemnatory as anything that ever was written, and proves him to have been guilty of a conduct which would be unpardonable under any circumstances, but which it is difficult, and would be uncharitable, perhaps, to characterize, when committed against a friend described by himself "as one of the purest-minded and kindest-hearted men that ever lived."

But what was Mr. Blakely's "last offence"? Dr. Montgomery tells us that it was subscribing to a testimonial given to the Rev. D. Maginnis, with the following heading—"I subscribe to express my strong disapprobation of those who have brought forward unfounded accusations against a faithful Christian minister." This

is "the head and front" of Mr. Blakely's never-to-be-forgiven offence. Was it not a poor excuse for refusing to comply with the last request of a long attached and devoted friend? Might not a man with much less of the divine element in his composition than Dr. Montgomery lays claim to, have overlooked it altogether, and granted a request which was kind and Christian in all its aspects? But the question arises, Was there anything in Mr. Blakely's act calculated to give *just offence* to Dr. Montgomery? Is it not competent for any man to express his *strong disapprobation* of the conduct even of a friend, when he knows that that friend has, either knowingly or ignorantly, accused wrongfully his brother? He utters no calumny against his friend. He does only what a sincere friend would do to bring his erring brother back to a knowledge of the truth, and a better performance of his duty. I respectfully submit that Mr. Blakely, in his subscription to the "Maginnis Testimonial," was not guilty of any real or even imaginary offence against Dr. Montgomery; and that it is an improper use of language to call that a calumny which a man believes, and which can be proved to be true by infallible evidence. Now, Mr. Blakely believed that unfounded charges had been preferred against Mr. Maginnis. He believed that Mr. Maginnis was an excellent man, and not only so, but that he was a faithful Christian minister, and one of the most active and useful Christian ministers in the Remonstrant Synod. Friendship for Dr. Montgomery could not be expected to stifle Mr. Blakely's justice towards a younger brother, and by his silence become a partaker in the iniquity of others. In subscribing, therefore, to the testimonial, he only exercised a right which ought to be accorded to all, and which implies no calumny either in fact or intention. Dr. Montgomery's displeasure was without just cause, and his ungenerous treatment of his old friend without palliation or excuse.

But even supposing Mr. Blakely had given utterance to a foul calumny against his early friend, that friend need not be told that Christianity inculcates upon all her disciples the virtue of a sincere *practical* forgiveness, and that Christ makes our forgiveness of the trespasses of others, the ground on which personal transgression shall be forgiven. On what Christian principle Dr. Montgomery will justify his conduct towards Mr. Blakely, during the last four years of his life, or his unnecessary and unprovoked attack upon his memory and character, a few months after his death, I am at a loss to conceive, but anxious to know. Doubly reprehensible is Dr. Montgomery, whose "moral constitution" is of so high an order, and whose willingness and ability to forgive are so peculiarly remarkable, when he allows the *will* to over-ride the power, and crush out the charities of life, and the practical virtues of Christianity from the catalogue of human duties.

I have now finished my review of Dr. Montgomery's letter, not that I have exhausted its misstatements, but because I have no heart to continue the unpleasant task. I have said sufficient to prove that Dr. Montgomery's statements are not reliable—that in several instances, he has made assertions that are absolutely untrue, and that there is no foundation for the assertions so maliciously and uncharitably preferred against Mr. Blakely. Like his

neighbours, my father-in-law, no doubt, had his failings; but unlike some of them, he was not a malinger of other men's characters, nor a renegade to religious liberty. And I entertain the hope, that in time to come, when men's works shall be judged, not by the envious living, but by an impartial posterity, honest Fletcher Blakely will be remembered as the *sincere* and *consistent* advocate of civil and religious freedom, and as the *first* in the North of Ireland, who *faithfully* and *fearlessly* preached rational and Scriptural Unitarianism.

I have only to add, that Dr. Montgomery has publicly accused Mr. Blakely of pecuniary defalcations to him, and I now ask him as publicly to furnish me with a statement of his accounts, and when the time comes, his vouchers can be examined to substantiate if possible his claim. He has accused Mr. Blakely with being a religious hypocrite—with ingratitude for rendered services—with railing against his brethren—with permitting his house to become a rendezvous for Dr. Montgomery's detractors—with passing him unsaluted, and with a scowl in the streets of Belfast, "his son David following his deluded father's unhappy example," and with being so mentally impotent as to have lost all self-control, and with moral faculties so deranged as to render him unaccountable for his deeds. These are the charges preferred by Dr. Montgomery against the man of whom he alleges that "nothing shall induce me to say an ungenerous word." How generous they are let your readers judge! That they are utterly false and unfounded I have shewn, and the man who made them now stands before the public as the wilful and heartless traducer of Fletcher Blakely.

NETHEREND, *March 12th*, 1863.

WM. COCHRANE.

[We regret that this correspondence extends to so great a length, especially as the matters treated of are so entirely of a personal nature. We have felt it only just to afford Mr. Cochrane as much space as he desired for his reply. Dr. Montgomery is entitled to a rejoinder; and we desire that the matter should then drop. If it is to be carried on still further, it must be through some other medium than our pages.—ED. CH. UN.]

BISHOP COLENSO AND HIS EPISCOPAL BRETHREN.

It was scarcely to be expected that Dr. Colenso's free handling of questions connected with the origin and historical authority of the Pentateuch should escape without notice from his brethren of the episcopal order in the Church of England; but few would *a priori* have conjectured the form which their animadversions would assume. After mature deliberation, it was decided to *write to him a letter!* pointing out to him the inconsistency of his published views with his vows and obligations as a clergyman and a bishop; and delicately hinting at the propriety of resigning his office, though, at the same time, expressing a hope that "through earnest

prayer and deeper study of God's word," he might be brought back to a state of belief in which he could properly discharge its functions. To this letter are subscribed the names of two archbishops and twenty-two bishops of English sees; two archbishops and eight bishops of Ireland; and six colonial bishops. It is a little surprising to find a body of men, several of whom could not translate and parse a verse of the Hebrew Bible were their lives dependent on so doing, recommending to an accomplished critic and scholar like Dr. Colenso, "*deeper study of God's word!*"

Bishop Colenso has written a modest but firm reply, declining to act on the suggestion offered by his episcopal brethren; referring to his book for the reasons which induce him to retain his office; and hinting that the progress of true religion would be greatly promoted by modifying the subscriptions and formularies by which so many members and clergymen of the Church are now enticed into making declarations which their mature judgment cannot but disapprove.

While we give to the archbishops and bishops full credit for a desire to adopt the gentlest measures with their heterodox brother, and for a reluctance to drag him before the ecclesiastical tribunals as a heretic, we cannot but think that the partial failure of the prosecution against Dr. Williams and Mr. Wilson for their share in the volume of *Essays and Reviews* has had its weight in influencing them to proceed by letter and not by charge. What advantage could be gained by suspending Bishop Colenso for a year, and then sending him back to his diocese; leaving his book behind him to influence the minds of thousands and tens of thousands of readers?

PROSECUTION OF PROFESSOR JOWETT FOR HERESY.

THE REV. BENJAMIN JOWETT, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of Oriel College, Oxford, and Regius Professor of Greek in the University, published, some time ago, the Greek text of St. Paul's Epistles to the Thessalonians, Galatians, and Romans, with a revised translation, copious notes, and illustrative dissertations, in which were many things that certainly seemed to us not merely calculated to sap the foundations of orthodoxy (especially upon the doctrine of the Atonement), but to inculcate opinions differing widely from the articles and formularies of the Church of England, however well calculated to throw light on the writings of the Apostle Paul. He likewise contributed an article to the volume entitled *Essays and Reviews*, the last, and, beyond all comparison, the best and ablest of the treatises contained in that book. On account of some alleged heresies enunciated in these publications, the authorities of the University of Oxford last year withheld from Mr. Jowett a supplemental salary which has long been annexed to his chair, leaving him to fulfil the duties of his professorship for the moderate sum of £40 per annum, which is paid by the crown. Not satisfied with this penalty, Dr. Pusey, who was himself suspended from his office some years ago for the dissemination of doctrines at variance

with those of the Church, came forward, in the course of last month, to prefer, in his own name and that of two other gentlemen, a charge of heresy against Professor Jowett, with a view to his dismissal from his fellowship and from his professorship. The accusation was brought before the Vice-Chancellor's Court of the University,—a court which is usually occupied with the recovery of small debts due by undergraduates, and other matters by no means involving knotty points of theology. After hearing much learned argument, the Assessor who sits as judge, decided that he had jurisdiction to try the case, but that there was no law or statute by which he was compelled to do so. Conceiving that it was optional with him to try the case or not, he determined to decline doing so. The prosecutors have given notice of an appeal to a higher court, but whether they will follow up their notice remains to be seen.

THE REV. J. S. PORTER AND HIS CRITICS.

Our readers are generally aware that a series of Lectures has been delivered recently in the First Meeting-House, Belfast, and that one of them, given by Mr. Porter, was on the "New Theology." The Lecture was most numerously attended, and it excited much interest. A local critic published a most unjust notice of it; and *The London Inquirer*, availing himself of this production, and some additional gossip from local correspondents (anonymous, of course), published one of those coarse, partisan attacks against what he is pleased to term "the retrograde party" in Ulster, which have from time to time for several years graced the columns of his paper. It represented Mr. Porter as having attacked the English Unitarians as being promoters of infidel opinions, and as having mentioned by name, from the pulpit, some ministers of the denomination in England as Pantheists, Deists, and Atheists. Mr. Porter promptly replied, saying that there was not a word of truth in the statement published by *The Inquirer*. On this, *The Inquirer* withdrew his charges in a spirit of frankness, which was certainly new; but next week's paper contained a letter signed "James Heron," maintaining that the statements of *The Inquirer* were substantially correct, and alleging that Mr. Porter had stated that an English Unitarian minister, who was recently a candidate for a pulpit in the North of Ireland, had represented himself to him as a Pantheist. Mr. Porter has replied in a few brief and pointed sentences, in which, in our opinion, he completely demolishes Mr. Heron's letter. We understand that Mr. Porter's Lecture is in the press, and will be issued in a few days. Its publication will show who is right; but we believe that it will then be evident that, although Mr. Heron has sounded all the depths of the New Theology, and is justly regarded in Belfast as one of its ablest and most consistent exponents, he has entirely misapprehended Mr. Porter's statements; and it will further be seen what is the character of those new views, which some of our Unitarian brethren are disposed to regard with approval, and for the advocacy of which they are not unwilling to open the pulpits of their Church.

INTELLIGENCE.

SOIREE AT PAISLEY.

ON Wednesday evening, February 4th, the Christian Unitarian Church of Paisley held their Annual Soiree. Their place of worship was tastefully ornamented with evergreens for the occasion. At the appointed hour the room was filled with a most respectable company, who joined in singing the Hundredth Psalm, and after prayer, by the Rev. C. J. M'Alester, tea was served. Mr. P. Callender, in the unexpected absence of Mr. Melvin, took the chair, and introduced the proceedings by some appropriate remarks. He then proposed the sentiment, "Christian Brotherhood," to which the Rev. C. J. M'Alester responded. He dwelt on the importance of cultivating peace and living in harmony, each acceding to others every liberty which he claims for himself; indeed, if he might have altered the wording of the text which the Chairman had given him, he would have made it "Human Brotherhood," for it was our duty to cultivate fraternal feelings, not only towards Christians of every denomination, but towards those who are not Christians. He illustrated the practical operation of this principle in the Temperance reformation, which in Scotland and other portions of the empire was being vigorously promoted. He went on to say, that the kindest and most liberal feelings towards others did not imply indifference to our individual convictions; and congratulated the Unitarians of Paisley on the successful efforts they had made for so many years to sustain their little Church, and maintain the Christian views which they had often heard from the lips of their eloquent friend, the late George Harris,—the views which had been ably expounded and vindicated by William Ellery Channing, and which had been held and valued by Newton, Locke, and Milton. He paid a well-deserved tribute of respect to their Chairman, Mr. Callender, who so acceptably and gratuitously supplied their pulpit.

"The zealous men of our Church in past times" was next proposed, and spoken to by Mr. Matthew Scott. He said—To the martyrs, confessors, and zealous men of our Church in past times, we owe in great measure the privilege we enjoy of living under the light and influence of our Unitarian faith. The Scriptures clearly teach our simple, benevolent doctrines. But, read in the light of popular preaching, they proclaim a religion of mystery and fear; and but for those good and gifted men of our household of faith, who, before our day, so nobly did their duty, we now present might, like others, have been worshipping a three-one God, who, from all eternity and for his own glory, elected some to everlasting life, and doomed all others to the pains of hell for ever. If, then, we truly value the glorious principles we profess—faith in one God, our Father,—submission to one Master and Leader to Life, Christ Jesus,—love towards one common brotherhood, all mankind—we must honour and venerate those fearless, faithful spirits of the past, the influence of whose lives and labours has reached to

present times, and helped to lead us and others into the right path. We can point to those who sealed their Christian Unitarianism with their blood. Amongst others, in this country, who suffered at the stake, were Lady Joan Bocher, George Van Parre, Bartholomew Legate, and Edward Wightman. We can count numbers not a few, whose lives were one continued course of devoted, self-sacrificing zeal in the cause we love and cherish. Think of Emlyn, Lardner, Lindsay, Priestley, Taylor, Belsham, Richard Wright, and last, not least—connecting the past with the present—George Harris. What striking contrast—the unflinching faithfulness to conscience, the manly, straightforward bearing of these Christian Reformers, and of many, many others like them whom I need not name, and the humiliating position of those would-be liberals of the present day, with their “non-natural” interpretation of Creeds and Articles to which they have solemnly declared their unfeigned assent and consent—a position which plain men *will* call dishonest, let learned “liberals” christen it by what new-fangled name they please. If those priests of the “Broad” way are right, how wrong were those martyrs and confessors of our Church whose zeal and courage we are now applauding! Servetus should have recanted his heresy, and meant that he didn’t,—Priestley should have written “Church and King” over his chapel door,—and the Irish Remonstrants should have *signed* the Westminster Confession, allowing those to *believe* it who were able and willing. I trust no one present has so learned Christ. The zealous men of our Church in past times, by their bright example, give us courage now, though years and ages intervene, and bid us fight the good fight, not under false colours, but rather glorying in the name we bear,—and run the Christian race, not in bonds which we affect to despise, yet hug, but in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free,—and live and labour through good and bad report, honestly, faithfully, for the victory and crown.

Mr. Callender spoke on “The Present Prospects of Liberal Christianity.” After referring to the principles of Liberal Christianity, and to Dr. Channing as their ablest and most eloquent exponent, and dwelling on the dissatisfaction which is felt by many, especially by the most educated, with the prevailing religious dogmas, he went on to say—At the present time there is a deeper, a wider, and a more earnest interest taken in the discussion of religious matters than has been for many years. And these discussions are not about mere forms of church government, rules, and ceremonies, as was often the case in former times, but they relate to the very foundations of the great principles of religious belief itself. Men are not now willing to be driven to the temple of God by the threats of a fallible priest, or the terrors of human law or future woe. If they are to embrace a faith, if they are to have any religious belief, they must know the grounds, the reasons, the evidences on which it rests. Blind submission to the dictum of a dark age is no longer considered as a religious duty, but rather as an indication of mental weakness. It is a settled truth that no man can answer for another at the bar of the great searcher of the human heart. The sentiment is becoming universal, that man must form his own creed, that he is responsible to God alone for

the manner in which he does it, and for the ideas which compose it. Already, from the new, improved, and searching critical investigations that have been conducted, and are being conducted, by men of learning, talent, and probity, much light has been thrown on the Bible within these few years, and there cannot be a doubt but that time will bring forth a more enlightened, a more natural and practical view of that Book, and the eternal religious truths which it contains, than has yet dawned upon the nations. The Unitarian Church has led the onward march in these matters, and it is towards the spirit and the faith of that Church that the age is tending. The time cannot be far distant when, in Christendom, "there shall be One Lord and his name One."

Mr. Charles Mills, junior pastor of the Congregation, delivered a very interesting address on "Sunday-Schools," a subject he is well qualified to treat of, from his experience as Superintendent of the thriving Sunday-School in connection with his church. Mr. Thomas Reid spoke intelligently on "The Progress of Science." Mr. John Dunlop—eldest son of the late Mr. Christopher Dunlop, who was for many years the highly-esteemed pastor of the church, and long to be remembered on account of his efficient missionary labours, freely undertaken, and sustained without fee or reward—moved a vote of thanks to the Rev. Mr. M'Alester for his kind acceptance of their invitation to be present, and for his very appropriate and excellent address, which was heartily responded to. Mr. Dunlop also moved a vote of thanks to their chairman and pastor, of whom he spoke in the highest terms of respect and sympathy,—which motion was also carried by acclamation.

The proceedings were pleasantly varied by the singing of several hymns and others pieces of music—a young lady of the congregation presiding at the harmonium; and in the course of the evening the company were regaled with fruit. The meeting was throughout of a most gratifying character.

We believe that the Paisley Congregation is the oldest in Scotland, having been organized some years earlier than that of Glasgow. It owes much of its stability to the efforts of the late Mr. Dunlop, whose family are still connected with it, and to Mr. Callender, whose useful and earnest life may yet, we trust, be spared for many years.

SUNDAY-SCHOOL TEACHERS' UNION.

On Thursday evening, March 13, a meeting of this Society was held in the vestry of the Second Meeting-house, Belfast, Mr. John Smith, jun., Milltown, Banbridge, in the chair. The Rev. T. Bowring opened the proceedings with prayer, and the Rev. C. J. M'Alester gave an address, the subject—"Half-an-hour with a Sunday-School Class," which was followed by an interesting conversation, in which the Revs. J. Jellie, T. Bowring, and others took part. The next meeting is to be held on an early evening, when Mr. Patterson has kindly promised to read a paper on "Natural History; its Influences, Intellectual and Moral." The subject and the lecturer should alike draw a large attendance of Sunday-School teachers.

YORK STREET CONGREGATION, BELFAST.

On Tuesday evening, March 24th, a Soiree of the members and friends of the York Street Non-Subscribing Congregation was held in the Corn Exchange. After tea the pastor of the Congregation, the Rev. J. Jellie, was called to the chair. The principal sentiments spoken to in the course of the evening were—"Civil and Religious Liberty," by Rev. W. Hall; "The Presbytery of Antrim," by Rev. J. Porter; "The Signs of the Times," by Mr. James Heron; and "Our Unitarian Brethren of the Sister Kingdom," by Rev. T. Smyth. Mr. Porter, in the course of his remarks, said—When he was ordained, no man asked him what his opinions were. He dared not do so. That was no business of his. No person but the congregation that chose him should catechise him. The congregation had a right to see how far his opinions were in accordance with theirs, and they exercised that right. But he spurned and treated with utter contempt, and denounced intermeddling ecclesiastics coming forward to catechise him or other men with regard to their opinions.

OBITUARY.

Died, at Girvan, Ayrshire, on March 18th, Mr. Matthew Scott. It is with much sorrow we record the death of this good man. Respected and beloved in the neighbourhood in which he lived, he was also known and esteemed far beyond the limits of his native town. By a careful and intelligent study of the Holy Scriptures, he was led, many years ago, to abandon the Calvinistic faith in which he had been educated, and to embrace the more rational views of Christian Unitarianism, of which he became an able and zealous advocate. By his exertions, aided by one or two valued friends, he succeeded in organizing a small Unitarian Congregation in Girvan, and in erecting a neat and commodious house of worship, in which, as a lay preacher, he officiated every Lord's day; while, by his sympathy and Christian counsel, he ministered diligently, and without reward, to the little flock he had gathered. Some of them were artisans who had gone from Ireland, Unitarian in their faith, who otherwise would have had no opportunity of worshipping in accordance with their convictions, and might have sunk into indifference, or been drawn back into the Calvinism of the Established or the Free Church of Scotland. In vindication of the views which Mr. Scott held, he was sometimes drawn into controversy with neighbouring ministers, and the pamphlets which he wrote show marked ability, and a great familiarity with the history of his adopted faith and the Scriptural grounds on which it rests. Although he publicly professed and boldly advocated views so opposed to the prevailing faith, he enjoyed the respect and esteem of his neighbours of all denominations, and, we believe, that in the town of Girvan no man possessed more of the public confidence than Matthew Scott. By his sudden death a happy home has been clouded with sorrow, the hearts of many friends have been

saddened, his native town has sustained a public loss, and the small congregation to which he faithfully ministered has been bereft of its principal stay and support. A few weeks ago our friend was in the enjoyment of vigorous health, and attended the annual soiree of the Paisley Congregation, speaking, as the report in our present number shows, with great ability on that interesting occasion. His mind was then full of plans for the extension of Christian Unitarianism in Scotland, but fearful for the spread of those semi-deistical views which in some quarters had been recently advocated under the name of Unitarianism. His feelings on this subject were briefly, but very strongly, expressed in a letter published in our January number, entitled "Unitarianism and Parkerism," and bearing the signature of "A Lay Preacher." We sincerely hope that the brethren in Girvan, though cast down by this sad event, will not allow their cause to sink, but will labour, according to their ability, to uphold and extend it, and thus raise the most acceptable monument to their departed friend and minister.

Died on March 15, at Bruslee, near Ballyclare, Mr. John Dundee, aged 83 years. Throughout his long life he was guided by the principles of genuine Christian piety; he was a kind, considerate, and generous friend; an unassuming, truthful, and honest man. He was the oldest member of session of the Ballyclare Non-Subscribing Congregation, and his name was brought prominently before the public during the unhappy discussions which terminated in the disruption of the Antrim Presbytery. The unjust rejection of Mr. Dundee by a majority of the Presbytery at their meeting in November, 1861, excited general indignation; and his fellow-worshippers and neighbours invited him to a public entertainment to express their respect for his character and their sympathy with him in the injustice to which he had been subjected. The esteem in which he was held was remarkably evinced by the large number of all denominations who attended his funeral. The service at his interment was conducted by the Revs. J. S. Porter and C. J. M'Alester, the former of whom delivered a most impressive address on the occasion.

Died, on March 11, at Hillbrook, Holywood, Margaret, eldest daughter of the late Wm. Dawson, Esq., Glenbannagh, County Down.

Died, on March 21, at the house of her brother-in-law, C. B. Grimshaw, Esq., Sydenham, Margaret Osborne, aged 76 years.

Died, on February 20, at Pittsfield, Illinois, Anne, wife of John D. Thomson, Esq., and third daughter of the late Rev. J. C. Ledlie, D.D., of Dublin.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

Communications for the Editor, to be addressed by post to Rev. C. J. M'Alester, Holywood; or, otherwise, to 45, Arthur Street, Belfast.

Orders for the work and business communications to be sent to the Agent of the Unitarian Society, 45, Arthur Street.

THE
CHRISTIAN UNITARIAN.

VOL. II.]

MAY, 1863.

[No. 4.

COLENSO ON THE PENTATEUCH.

(Concluded from p. 49.)

THE second part of Bishop Colenso's book is now before us; it consists of 222 pages, with a preface of 36; and as a third portion is announced, the whole, when put together, will make a volume of very respectable size. The undergrowth which usually precedes an ecclesiastical thunder-storm is already beginning to make itself heard: it is to be hoped the bolts will be launched against the Bishop's book, not hurled against his head; but this is a matter with which, as Christian Unitarians, we have no concern, except to protest, as we do, against every attempt to put down free inquiry, or the honest expression of conscientious opinion, by civil or ecclesiastical penalties. We should dwell on this point at greater length did we not fear that our advocacy of the cause of Dr. Colenso might injure rather than aid him, if his episcopal brethren shall ultimately decide to drag him before the Church's tribunals as a heretic. Will the world never be sick of witnessing prosecutions for heresy, in a Church which calls herself protestant and reformed?

The object which Dr. Colenso proposes to himself in this, the second part of his book, is, to consider the age and authorship of the Pentateuch. It is a more difficult question than that with which the previous volume was occupied; for it is often easy to prove that a document or a history could not have been written by a certain man at a given time, while yet it may be altogether impossible to name the exact person by whom it was composed, or the precise date at which it made its appearance. But we ought not to despair of the result of careful criticism. Some approach has already been made to unanimity

among critics and scholars, who alone are competent to enter upon such investigations; and the efforts of writers, who imagine that they can throw light upon a dark and as yet unsettled problem, are not to be discouraged, though we may think them over-sanguine. Every earnest and thoughtful attempt to penetrate the mystery is to be welcomed. The writer who makes such an attempt may not be able to reach the hidden shrine; yet he may shew where others have wandered from the right road; and this may enable succeeding inquirers to find the path which he himself failed to discover. We believe that the Bishop of Natal has added a very important contribution to the stock of critical material, amassed during the last hundred years, whereby the interesting questions, *When was the Pentateuch written? and by whom?* must be determined: but we cannot in justice or candour declare that he has placed the matter beyond a doubt. On some details we differ totally from his conclusions.

On one point it may be asserted without fear of contradiction that there is now a general agreement among all scholars who have really given their minds to the inquiry, viz., that the book of Genesis and the first six chapters of Exodus are not a *homogeneous history* composed by one author, but a *compilation* of documents or narratives derived from different sources. It is the *prevailing* opinion among critics that the remaining thirty-four chapters of the book of Exodus, together with the books of Leviticus and Numbers, have been put together in the same way; and that Deuteronomy was not written till some time after the completion of the other four books by which it is preceded in our Bibles.

The principal grounds upon which the first of these opinions rests can be made intelligible to the attentive reader of the Scriptures, even in a modern translation. When any one takes up the Authorized English Version of the Old Testament, and reads the first two chapters of Genesis, he is sure to be struck with the difference between the two accounts which they contain of the creation of the earth and heavens. In the first chapter, the earth when created is a *watery chaos*; and the writer explains how the moisture was got rid of, so as to leave the land fit for the sustenance of plants and animals; in

the second, the earth is produced *hard and dry*, and the historian is careful to state the means by which it was irrigated, so as to become capable of supporting vegetable and animal life. In the first, man is the *last created* of all the animated beings; in the second, he is the *first*. In the first chapter man is made "*in the image of God*," and endowed with power and authority over the other creatures: In the second, he is made "*out of the dust of the earth*," and only for the purpose of dressing and keeping the garden in which he was placed. In the first chapter the man and the woman are made *at the same time*, on the latter part of the sixth day; "male and female created he them:" in the second, *an interval elapsed* between the creation of man and the production of woman; and woman is not, strictly speaking, created at all; she is constructed out of a rib taken out of the man's side during sleep. These things strike even an intelligent child when it is put to read the Bible, and have puzzled the brains of learned men, who have been trying to "reconcile" them for the last fifteen hundred years. It is somewhat remarkable that in the beginning of the fifth chapter the narrative returns to the statement in the first, namely, that man was made in the image of God, and that the male and female were created on the same day.

Again, in the fourth chapter of Genesis there is a table of the progeny of Cain, and in the fifth a similar but enlarged table of the descendants of Seth; and it is noteworthy that if the names from Adam to Lamech in the former, and those from Enoch (which is a word of the same signification as Adam, *man*) down to Lamech in the other be compared together, they will be found to be generally the same; one name only being essentially different, and two others being differently placed in the two lists. The inquiring mind instinctively asks, how does this happen? It is certainly a very unusual thing to find two distinct families, having apparently no intercourse with each other, yet preserving an identity of names, and all the names *new** in their respective genealogies throughout six or seven generations.

* It is proper to note this circumstance, because it negatives the cause which often accounts for the predominance of certain names in different branches of a family or clan, viz., the repetition of the names of common ancestors.

Still further. When we come to the narrative of the general deluge, we meet with a perplexing circumstance. The animals are first brought to Noah in *pairs*, two and two of each kind; and immediately afterwards we are told that the clean animals entered by *sevens*, and the unclean in pairs, the male and the female. After the deluge Noah builds an altar and offers a sacrifice of every sort of clean beasts and every sort of clean birds, which, if the former statement were correct, could not have been done without destroying the whole race for ever.

We shall quote one example more. In the 20th and 21st chapters of Genesis we read that Abraham sojourned in Gerar, and there he denied his wife. Abimelech, the king of the country, took her, but restored her immediately in consequence of a divine admonition. Soon afterwards Abimelech, accompanied by Phicol the captain of his host, sought Abraham and proposed a treaty of peace: Abraham consented, provided satisfaction were first granted for a *well* which Abimelech's servants had taken from his. The well was given up; the treaty was sworn; and therefore the name of the place was called *Beer-Sheba*, "the Well of the Oath." But in the 26th chapter the same story, with trifling variations in detail, is told of Abraham's son, Isaac. He also sojourned in Gerar, and denied his wife for the very same reason which had influenced Abraham. Abimelech discovered Rebecca's relationship to her husband, and was horror-stricken at the thought of the enormity that might have resulted from Isaac's dissimulation. The king, accompanied, as in the former instance, by Phicol, the captain of the host, proposed an alliance. There had been several contentions between the servants of Abimelech and those of Isaac about the possession of some *wells* which Isaac's men had dug, and which the servants of Abimelech had seized; but these appear to have been amicably adjusted, and the treaty of peace was mutually sworn. The next day, the servants of Isaac found water in a well which they had previously been digging; and so the name of the city was called *Beer-Sheba*, "the Well of the Oath." What man that reads his Bible thoughtfully has not felt his mind perplexed by these narratives?

How is it conceivable that the same series of events, the places, also, and the other parties being identical, could have happened to two different persons? Does history repeat itself in this manner? Is there not reason to suspect that here, and in similar examples elsewhere, we have before us the compositions of two distinct historians, who have followed two diverging lines of record or of tradition, and whose works, though inconsistent with each other, have been blended together by the person (whoever he may have been) to whom we owe the book of Genesis?

Without pursuing this line of investigation farther, it may be stated that it is the all but unanimous judgment of scholars and critics who have investigated these questions, that the book of Genesis and the first six chapters of Exodus, at least, if not likewise the whole of the first four books of the Pentateuch, have been compiled in the manner indicated in the last of the foregoing questions. We have, in the specified portions, documents which proceeded from two distinct and separate writers, very inartificially united together, so as to present the outward appearance of a continuous narrative, though unquestionably without preserving anything like the consistency which we should expect in a real, much less in a contemporary, or nearly contemporary, history. And although there are a few places in which it may be difficult to determine with absolute certainty what portion of the book belongs to one, what to the other of the two writers, yet in most cases the matter is plain and easy. In some instances each of the incorporated documents has its own title prefixed, which cuts it off from what goes before. Thus in Gen. ii. 4, "*These are the Generations of the Heavens and the Earth.*" Gen. v. 1, "*This is the Book of the Generations of Adam.*" And so "*The Generations of the Sons of Noah,*" "*The Generations of Shem,*" &c. But this is not always the case, and therefore we are under the necessity of judging at times by internal indications, and of these the surest is afforded by the names which are habitually employed to denote the supreme Being. One series of documents uniformly speaks of the Deity by the name "God,"—in Hebrew *Elohim*; the other, though it occasionally uses that term,

employs habitually and most frequently the proper name *Jehovah* as the designation of the Almighty. The English version does not retain this term, as it ought to have done;* but the unlearned reader may be aware of its presence in the original, if he will only bear in mind that it is the word which is expressed by the term LORD printed in capitals. And if he will look to the passages to which we have already adverted, he will find that in the first account of the creation (Gen. i. 1, to Gen. ii. 3) the name of the Deity is *God* only; in the second (Gen. ii. 4, to ii. 25), the term *Jehovah* is found; the genealogical table of the posterity of Cain (Gen. iv. 17, to iv. 26) occurs in a passage where the writer, when he speaks in his own person, uses the proper name *Jehovah*; but in that of the Sethites the Deity is designated as *God* simply. For brevity's sake the passages in which "*Jehovah*" is used, are called *Jehovistic*, and those in which the term "*God*" occurs exclusively, are called *Elohistic*. Speaking in this manner, the one account of the animals in the ark is *Elohistic*, the other *Jehovistic*; and it is not difficult to separate the passages which belong to each, although they are intermixed. So likewise the document which describes Abraham as having given its name to Beer-Sheba is *Elohistic*, whilst that which attributes the same transaction to Isaac is *Jehovistic*. This distinction is maintained throughout the whole book of Genesis and the first six chapters of Exodus; and from a comparison of style and favourite expressions which are peculiar to each writer, it can be traced, with a certain degree of probability, throughout the whole of Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers. If the Elohistic documents are read in succession, it will be found that they give a tolerably complete and connected account of the sacred history of the world; the Jehovistic passages sometimes interrupt the narrative, at other times they are manifestly supplements to the Elohistic documents. In either case, it is plain that they must be regarded as a more recent addition to a previously existing text. But it is by no means easy to determine when and by whom each series of documents was composed.

* *Jehovah* is properly retained in the *Revised Translation*, wherever it occurs in the original Hebrew.

In this inquiry Bishop Colenso has taken much pains, and, as we shall hereafter indicate, has struck out a new line of argument which deserves careful consideration.

It is to be borne in mind that the Elohistic writer represents the Deity as assuming the name of Jehovah, for the first time, on the eve of the departure of the Israelites from Egypt, and as expressly affirming that by that name he had never been known before, not even to the patriarchs Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. (Exod. vi. 3.) The Jehovist, on the contrary, represents the name Jehovah as having been in constant use from the very creation of the human race, and as having been quite familiar to the mouths of all sorts of people, idolators and sinners, as well as saints. Hence it has been conjectured that the Elohist wrote at a time when that mysterious name was as yet comparatively unknown to the bulk of the Hebrew people; and that the Jehovist composed his work when it had come into general use. If, then, the time can be fixed when the name Jehovah began, as it were, to make its appearance, that epoch might be assigned as the probable date of the *Elohistic* writer; and although it may appear very hard to determine that period in the absence of contemporary monuments, yet there is one indication which history affords, and which is entitled to great weight, viz., the manner in which proper names of persons are compounded, when they involve some reference to the Supreme Being. Such names are very frequent in Jewish history. Now, it is remarkable that in all the ancient annals of the Abrahamic race, names compounded with *El* (God) are of frequent occurrence. Mahalaleel, Israel, Jahleel, Eliab, Paltiel, &c., &c., and many others of the same kind, are found in the Pentateuch itself: but only *two* persons—Joshua and Jochebed—bear names into the composition of which any part of the the term Jehovah enters. One of these names is asserted to have been conferred by Moses himself after the communication of the sacred word *Jehovah* had been made to him. Quite similar is the case in the books of Joshua and Judges. It is not till after the days of Samuel that such names as Jonathan, Adonijah, Shephatiah, Benaiah, Jehoiada, &c. (all of which involve a

fragment of the word Jehovah,) are found and become frequent.*

This circumstance has been noticed by preceding critics ; but there is an additional argument of the same kind, which, so far as we know, has been brought forward for the first time by Bishop Colenso. It is, that the Psalms in the Bible indicate the very same period as the time in which the term Jehovah came into general use as the personal and proper name of the Deity. The Bishop has carefully considered the internal indications of the age and authorship of the various odes that are contained in the *five* books which make up what we are in the habit of calling "the Book of Psalms." Some of them are certainly older than the time of David : *in these the word Jehovah never occurs.* Others belong to the earlier part of David's life : *in these it rarely presents itself.* In the Psalms, written towards the close of his life and reign, *it becomes more frequent ;* and in many of the post-Davidic Psalms it is the name of Deity that is *almost exclusively employed.* From all this he draws the inference that it was in or shortly after the time of Samuel that the name Jehovah began to supplant the older term of God, in the minds and in the speech of the Jewish nation ; and hence he conjectures that the Elohist writer in the Pentateuch, —who is so careful to explain the introduction, and to assert the divine authority of that designation,—must have lived about the time of Samuel ; and most probably was no other than Samuel himself. The Jehovist, he conceives, might have been Gad or Nathan, or some other of the persons who sat at the feet of Samuel in the "School of the Prophets," which he certainly conducted and probably set on foot. Judging from the Bishop's own data, we should refer the Jehovist to a much later era. One who had learned from the lips of Samuel himself,—or of the Elohist, whoever he may have been,—that the term Jehovah was unknown before the time of the departure from Egypt, would never have employed it as the common and customary title of Deity in describ-

* The writer of the Chronicles introduces such names at a much earlier period ; but as that book was not written till three generations had elapsed after the return of the Jews from Babylon, its statements on such points carry little weight.

ing the history of the world ; putting it into the mouths of all sorts of persons as a familiar term ; and even representing the Deity as using it himself, in his intercourse with the patriarchs of old.

On another point, also, we find ourselves at issue with Dr. Colenso. He conceives that the writer of the Jehovistic portions of the Pentateuch was the person who interwove his own narratives with the work of the preceding historian,—the Elohist,—and so produced the five books—or the first four of them—pretty nearly in the order in which they now stand. We cannot believe this. The Jehovist must have perceived and known the irreconcilable opposition between his own statements and those of his predecessor. He never would have attempted to agglutinate the clay and iron together as the compiler of the Pentateuch has done. No. The “Five Books” were put together at a time when *both documents*—the Elohist and the Jehovistic—had acquired the veneration which is connected in the minds of men with distant antiquity. They were put together in an uncritical age, when contradictions were unperceived or unheeded, and when the great object with every historian was to make his narrative as full as all the materials at his command enabled him. We have no hesitation in delivering it as our judgment that the Pentateuch, as it now stands, is considerably more recent than the time of Nathan or of Gad.

What, then, was its date as a whole work ? We can only approximate the answer. It is certainly more ancient than the date of the Septuagint Greek Version of the Old Testament (about A.C. 280) ; for in that translation it appears in possession of its full authority as the first of the books of the Jewish Scripture. It must be more ancient even than the times of Nehemiah and Ezra ; for the Samaritans,—who at that time decidedly separated themselves from the Jewish nation, or were cast off by the Jews,—while they reject the other writings of the Old Testament, preserve and revere the Pentateuch as the great authority in all matters of religion. They would never have borrowed such a book from the Jews after the days of Nehemiah. To us it appears probable that “the Book of the Law,” which was found by Hilkiah

in the temple, in the days of Josiah (2 Kings xxii. 8,) and of which it is evident that *neither the High-Priest, nor the King, nor the officers of state had ever heard before*, was no other than the Pentateuch. How long it had been written previously to its being discovered in the House of Jehovah, no one can tell: but that occurrence took place at least 600 years before the time of Christ, though still *upwards of 800 years after the days of Moses*.

It will scarcely be necessary to guard the attentive reader against the idea that the Pentateuch, by whomsoever composed, involves and incorporates no records older than the times of the two principal authors whose united works make it up as it now stands. This would be to suppose that the Elohist and the Jehovist framed their narratives from their own notions exclusively, and drew their materials from their own imaginations. No sane man can suppose that works so composed could ever have been adopted as national histories by the people whose origin they described. We find explicit proof of the contrary. Genealogical tables were in use from the very earliest period after the invention of writing; and it is probable that several such pedigrees of their illustrious ancestors and of their families, were in the hands of the Jewish people, and were employed by their historians as helps in the composition of their narratives. The treaty between Abraham and the Hittites for the purchase of the cave of Machpelah was probably committed to writing at an early period (Gen. xxiii.); the account of it reads like an abstract of title from the pen of a conveyancer. There seems to be no reason to doubt that the principal laws which are embodied in the last four books of the Pentateuch—moral, political, and ceremonial—had been handed down in a written form,—perhaps from the very days of Moses himself. There certainly existed a “book” or catalogue of the encampments of the Israelites in the desert, the authorship of which was attributed to Moses. (Num. xxiii. 1, 2.) So also the account of the discomfiture of the Amalekites is ascribed to him (Exod. xvii. 14,) and the “*Book of the Covenant*” (Exod. xxiv. 4—7.) The compiler of the Pentateuch had also before him a document which he calls the “*Book of the Wars of Jehovah*” (Num. xxi. 14,) to which he appeals.

as his authority. To these may be added poetical pieces, such as the "Song of Miriam," and the "Song of the Princes at the Well," which could easily be handed down, even if not committed to writing. But after all, it is probable that the authors, both of the Elohistie and Jehovistic portions, were obliged to rely largely for many of their details on local traditions, family annals, and national beliefs; and although narratives derived from such sources are apt to abound in exaggerations,—especially in regard to numbers,—yet they are seldom destitute of all foundation in fact. With respect to the main argument of Bishop Colenso's book, it is our deliberate conviction that, although much that is apocryphal has mingled with the history of the deliverance of the Israelites from Egyptian bondage, yet his work leaves untouched the great fact that they left the banks of the Nile under divine superintendence, and that the Almighty revealed himself to them as the one living God, the only true Deity, the Creator of heaven and earth. Their possession of this knowledge, and the fact of their possessing it exclusively, seem to me to demonstrate that they derived it from a divine source. It could not have come to them from any other nation; and they were incapable of discovering it for themselves without divine assistance. This is a point which Dr. Colenso has once or twice touched upon, but which we hope he will take occasion, in the sequel of his book, to illustrate at greater length.

J. SCOTT PORTER.

LINES ON A SKELETON.

BEHOLD this ruin! 'Twas a skull
Once of ethereal spirit full;
This narrow cell was life's retreat:
This space was thought's mysterious seat.
What beauteous visions filled this spot,
What dreams of pleasure long forgot!
Nor hope, nor love, nor joy, nor fear,
Has left one trace of record here.

Beneath this mouldering canopy
Once shone the bright and busy eye.
But start not at the dismal void,
Nor sigh for greatness thus destroyed.
If with no lawless fire it gleamed,
But through the dews of kindness beamed,
That eye shall be for ever bright
When stars and suns are sunk in night.

Within this hollow cavern hung
The ready, swift, and tuneful tongue.
If falsehood's honey it disdained,
And, where it could not praise, was chained ;
If bold in virtue's cause it spoke,
Yet gentle concord never broke,
This silent tongue shall plead for thee
When time unveils eternity.

Say did these fingers delve the mine,
Or with its envied rubies shine ?
To hew the rock or wear the gem
Can little now avail to them ;
But if the page of truth they sought,
Or comfort to the mourner brought,
These hands a richer meed shall claim
Than all that wait on wealth or fame.

Avails it whether bare or shod
These feet the paths of duty trod ?
If from the bowers of ease they fled,
To seek affliction's humble shed ;
If grandeur's guilty bribe they spurned,
And home to virtue's cot returned ;
These feet with angels' wings shall vie,
And tread the palace of the sky.

CONGREGATIONAL MEMOIRS.

BALLYCARRY (OR BROADISLAND) CONGREGATION.

*(Continued from p. 86.)***A.D. 1759 to 1763, vacant.**

Between the death of Mr. Cobham, in 1759, and the settlement of his successor, Mr. Bankhead, in 1763, an interval of four years elapsed, during which the Ballycarry Congregation was supplied with preaching by the Presbytery of Templepatrick. In the old Minute Book I find the following entries referring to this period:—

“LURGAN, *June 26, 1759.*—A letter from the Congregation of Broadisland was read, wherein they desire supplies until next meeting. The Probationers were asked what supply money they received from that Congregation. They answered that six shillings was the sum paid them. The Presbytery resolved to grant the above request, and that the people of Broadisland should be informed that, according to the Synod's instructions, they ought to pay at least half-a-guinea to each supplier for preaching upon the Lord's Day.

“BALLYNURE, *August 14, 1759.*—A letter from Broadisland Congregation was read, wherein they desire to be supplied in the usual way until next meeting. This granted.

“BELFAST, *Nov. 6, 1759.*—From Broadisland Congregation appeared John Clarke, supplicating that a Committee of the Presbytery be appointed to meet at Ballycarry so soon as may be convenient, to assist them in fixing their accounts with the executor of their late Rev. Pastor, Mr. Cobham, and also that they be supplied until next meeting by Mr. Leathes, two days for every one that the other Probationers supply them; and the reason they assign for desiring Mr. Leathes so often is that he may baptize their children. The Presbytery considered the above supplication, and agreed to grant the first part of it, and accordingly have appointed Messrs. Wm. Thompson, Fullerton, Dunbar, and Rodgers to meet at Ballycarry the second Tuesday in December, to assist the people of Broadisland and Mr. Cobham (son and executor of the minister) in stating their accounts; Mr. Dunbar to preach. And as to the second part of their supplication, the Presbytery judged that it would be making an unfavourable distinction to appoint Mr. Leathes or any other Probationer so often as desired by the people of Ballycarry, when there is no intention to give a call, and therefore that the people of Broadisland may be obliged, as far as the Presbytery think that proper at present, an ordained minister is appointed to exchange with the Probationers once in the month for the baptizing of children.”

Is it possible that the real reason of the Ballycarry people wishing to have Mr. Leathes so often was that

that gentleman had consented to preach for them at their rate of six shillings a Sunday, instead of the half-guinea which the Presbytery had enjoined them to pay? The excuse of wishing to have a favourite *Probationer* to baptize their children (!!) was evidently absurd. In the Presbyterian Church, Probationers cannot baptize children.

“BALLYNURE, Jan. 15, 1760.—From Broadisland appeared Samuel M'Dowell. He informed the Presbytery that he was appointed by that Congregation to attend upon this meeting of Presbytery; but had no written commission or supplication; and that it was the general desire of that Congregation that Mr. Leathes should supply the one-half of the time until next meeting of the Presbytery, and the other half should be filled up by ministers and probationers. The Presbytery agreed to sustain the person from Broadisland as a Commissioner at this time; but informed him that unless they send a Commissioner with a written commission and supplication, he will not be sustained as such in time to come. The Commissioner's desire was also granted. The Presbytery inquired if the Committee met at Ballycarry as appointed, and it appeared they did; and that they found the state of accounts between that Congregation and the executor of their late Rev. Minister to be as followeth, viz.: that Mr. Edmunstone and his tenants had a discharge for seventeen pounds sterling, paid annually since the time of the late Rev. Mr. Cobham's settlement in 1700 until 1759. Mr. Cobham says that by his father's books, carefully examined by him and Robert Symmanton, it appears that by that division of Broadisland Congregation called Magheramorne, the sum of £84 18s. 1½d. is due; by Ballybentrum, the sum of £9 5s. 4½d.; by Ballyhill, £45 17s. 6d.; by Dobbsland, £18 10s. 9d.; by Killroot, £24 10s. 9d.; in all, £183 2s. 6½d. James Ferres excepted against the sum of arrear charged upon Magheramorne, alleging that the people in that part of the Congregation had not ground in the meeting-house equal to the stipend laid upon them; and that this was made appear at a Committee which met at Ballycarry some years ago, when the meeting-house was measured. [Probably the first time that preaching was ever paid for by the yard!] Mr. Cobham alleged that he had nothing to say to that matter; the Congregation were to look to it; and to this James Ferris agreed. Samuel M'Dowell alleged that Killroot and Dobbsland were put into the hands of Alex. Gillespy in 1754, and that he was answerable for the arrear since that time. To this Alex. Gillespy agreed; and Mr. Cobham and he fixed the arrear since that time, which, added to what arrears Samuel M'Dowell allowed was due at November, 1754, makes up the exact sum charged upon these divisions of the parish by Mr. Cobham. Some of the people in Magheramorne produced receipts for twelve shillings, which Mr. Cobham admitted, and deducted out of the arrear charged upon them. Several persons in Magheramore offered to pay Mr. Cobham, provided he would give each person a discharge, if it should appear by his father's book that they were

clear. Mr. Cobham would not comply with this proposal. He said he was willing to give such a receipt as the Committee would prescribe. The people of Magheramorne also agreed to this. The following receipt was proposed, viz.: 'Received from A. B., the sum of —, which appears, by the last payment made by the said A. B., entered in my father's book, to be in full of one year's stipend.' This receipt was agreeable to Mr. Cobham and the people. The Committee recommended it to the people in Broadisland Congregation to appoint collectors, and to use all possible diligence to raise the arrears; and they promised to be diligent in collecting what they found to be due by the people now living. The Presbytery asked Samuel M'Dowell if he could give any account of what the people in Broadisland Congregation had done with respect to the arrears. He said he had no instructions about that matter. Supplies appointed to Broadisland."

"BALLYNURE, *April 15, 1760.*—From Broadisland Congregation appeared Robert Symmenton, Commissioner, supplicating that supplies may be appointed to that Congregation in the usual way, and that the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper may be administered to them when it shall be convenient to the Presbytery; and that a Committee of the Presbytery be appointed to meet at Ballycarry, the second Tuesday in May, to assist them in settling their affairs. The above supplication was granted, and the Presbytery agreed that the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper be administered to the Congregation of Broadisland, the second Sabbath in July, by Messrs. William Thompson, William Rodgers, and David Fullerton; Mr. Dunbar to keep the fast. The members of the Committee to meet at Broadisland, are Messrs. Lewson, Dunbar, Rodgers, and Montgomery. Supplies appointed for Broadisland.

"LURGAN, *June 24, 1760.*—The Committee met as appointed at Ballycarry, and reported that nothing could be got done. The people who owed arrears of stipend absolutely refused to pay any until Mr. James Cobham would make out a full discharge to every one for the sum paid, and for the year for which they paid, according to his father's book. This he refused to do, and would give only a receipt for the money received. Mr. Thompson informed the Presbytery, that Broadisland Congregation desired to be supplied as formerly. The Presbytery agreed to overlook their not sending a Commissioner to this meeting, as it is a great distance from that place, and have ordered them to be supplied.

"TEMPLEPATRICK, *August 12, 1760.*—A letter from the Congregation of Broadisland, subscribed by Archibald Edmundstone, Esq., and Robert Symmenton, was read, wherein they represent it to be the desire of that Congregation to be supplied until next Presbytery, in the usual manner. The Presbytery agreed to grant this request, and also, that Mr. Fullerton shall write that Congregation to send a Commissioner to the Presbytery in time to come.

"BELFAST, *November 4, 1760.*—A letter from Broadisland was read, wherein they desire to be supplied till next meeting, in the ordinary way; which was granted.

CARRICKFERGUS, *Dec. 9, 1760.*—From Broadisland appeared Commissioners, John Sillyman and John Clark, supplicating that they

may be supplied every other Sabbath till next meeting by ordained ministers, and the rest of the time by probationers. This granted. A paper was also given in to the Presbytery by Samuel M'Dowell, subscribed by a considerable number of Broadisland Congregation, wherein they complain that some of their members, particularly the people in Killroot, are entertained and receive privileges by the Congregation of Carrickfergus, though they are in arrear, some of them one, some two, and some six or eight years, which is very hurtful to the interest of their Congregation. Some of the people complained of, particularly James M'Ferran, appeared. He declared he would pay all the arrear stipend due by him to the executors of the late Rev. Mr. Cobham. Mr. Fullerton also promised that none of the people in Killroot should receive privileges in the Congregation of Carrickfergus, unless they were certified by the Session of Broadisland. The Presbytery, after hearing the Commissioners from Broadisland, and the declaration made by Mr. Fullerton, unanimously agreed that the people in Killroot, against whom the complaint was especially made, should still be looked upon as members of Broadisland Congregation, and therefore if they chuse to hear sermon at Carrickfergus, they must continue to pay stipend at Broadisland; and that they receive no privileges from the Minister or Session of Carrickfergus, unless they apply by certificate from the Session of Broadisland. A copy of this minute to be read in Broadisland and in Carrickfergus next Sabbath day. The Commissioners from Broadisland informed this Presbytery that they had collected some part of the arrear stipend due the executors of Mr. Cobham, but cannot satisfy the people by whom the arrear stipend is due with discharges, they being unwilling to accept such discharges as Mr. James Cobham proposed to give. The Presbytery, willing to do everything in their power to oblige the people of Broadisland, resolved that Mr. Fullerton should advise Mr. Cobham to attend with him at Ballycarry the second Monday in January next, when the heads of that congregation are to meet, and he and Mr. Cobham are to endeavour to satisfy that people, if possible, with discharges. Supplies appointed for Ballycarry.

" BALLYNURE, *Feb. 24, 1761.*—From Broadisland no Commissioner appeared. The Presbytery were surprised that the people of that congregation do not think proper to send Commissioners to inform them if they desire supplies or not. It was agreed to by the Presbytery to supply them in the usual way till next meeting, and Mr. Rodgers is appointed to preach to that Congregation next Sabbath, and to inform them that though the Presbytery have sent them supplies at this time, yet they are not resolved to do so for the future, unless they make application for them by Commissioners.

" LAIRNE, *April 29, 1761.*—From Broadisland appeared Commissioners Robert Symmenton and John Blair, supplicating for supplies in the usual way until next meeting, and that the sacrament of the Lord's Supper would be administered to them as soon as may be convenient. Their supplication was granted, and the Sacrament is to be administered to that people the third Sabbath

in July next by Messrs. Thompson, Rodgers, and Fullerton : Mr. Thompson to preside. Supplies appointed for Ballycarry.

“DERRY, *June 30, 1761.*—Mr. Rodgers informed the Presbytery that Broadisland Congregation desired to be supplied in the ordinary way, and that the next meeting of the Presbytery would be at Ballycarry, of which notice should be given to Mr. James Cobham, that he may attend in order to have accounts settled with him. The Presbytery agreed to excuse Broadisland's not sending Commissioners at this time, as the place of meeting is far distant from them, and have complied with their desire. The next meeting to be at Ballycarry, the third Tuesday in August : Mr. Fullerton to give Mr. Cobham notice to attend at that meeting. Supplies appointed for Ballycarry.

BALLYCARRY, *August 18, 1761.*—The Congregation of Broadisland were informed of the Presbytery's meeting here on this day, to inspect into the state of their accounts with the executor of the late Rev. Mr. Cobham, and to assist them in the management of their congregational affairs. Mr. James Cobham attended, and was desired to produce an account of the arrears now due by that congregation. He informed the Presbytery that the sum of arrears was much the same as when his father, their late minister, died ; Archibald Edmunstone, Esq., and his tenants excepted, who had paid what arrear was due by them, as he had formerly told the Presbytery. Recourse was had to the Presbytery's records, by which it appeared that the arrear charged upon that congregation, exclusive of Mr. Edmunstone's tenants, amounted to £183 2s 6½d.

“From Broadisland appeared Commissioners—John Silliman to represent the divisions called Broadisland and Ballybentra ; Sam. M'Dowell and Alexander Gillespy, the divisions called Killroot, Dobbsland, and Ballyhill ; James Ferris and John Clark appeared from Magheramorne.

“The Presbytery found that £9 5s 4d of arrears was charged upon Ballybentra, and asked John Silliman what account he had to give of said arrear. He replied, that the sum of seven pounds was only due by that pennacle (*sic*) of the Congregation, and of that he should give an account presently.

“Samuel M'Dowell and Alexander Gillespy were asked how the arrear of £24 10s 9d, charged upon Killroot, was to be paid. They replied, that they could answer only for the arrear due at November, 1754, which was £11 14s 3½d, of which sum seven shillings and sixpence had been paid by John M'Cullough ; and they produced a charge from Mr. Bryce, for barley given to the late Rev. Mr. Cobham by his tenants and his mother, which they think should pay the greater part of the arrear charged upon Killroot.

“These Commissioners were also asked what account they had to give of the arrear of Dobbsland, which was £18 10s, and Ballyhill. They alleged that Mr. Dalway was to answer for Ballyhill, and there were collectors to answer for the arrears upon Dobbsland since November 1754, and at that time the arrear of Dobbsland amounted to £6 0s 10d, of which one guinea had been paid by Mr. Dobbs.

“The Commissioners that appeared for Magheramorne were

desired to give an account of the payment of the arrear in that division of the parish which they represented, and which amounted to £84 18s 1½d. They produced a paper, signed by persons in each division of the Congregation, wherein they set forth that the Rev. Mr. Cobham, at the time of his death, was indebted to the whole Congregation, for ploughing five acres of land for forty-eight years, the sum of £77 10s, and also that he was indebted to Magheramorne for grassing, which he had from James Wilson, Esq., their landlord, on account of stipend, and for which he did not give them credit, the sum of £16 2s 10d. In their paper they also set forth that the people are dead who owed the greater part of said arrear, and therefore it should not be charged upon them.

"The Commissioner from Ballybentra who was first spoken to, informed the Presbytery that he thought none of the arrear charged on the pennacle (*sic*) of the Congregation he represented, ought to be paid, since Mr. Cobham did not sue at law Mr. James Edmunstone, who had bound himself for the stipend of that part of the Congregation.

"The Presbytery considered the several representations made by the Commissioners from the different divisions of Broadisland Congregation, and the joint charge for ploughing, given in by the whole congregation, and after mature deliberation, came to the following resolutions:—

"1. The Presbytery think it would have been very disagreeable to Mr. Cobham, or any minister, to sue any person or persons for stipend, and therefore the people of Broadisland Congregation should have taken the obligation which Mr. Cobham had of Mr. James Edmunstone, and obliged him to pay up the stipend he was bound for; but as it does not appear that this has been done, the people and Mr. Cobham should compromise the matter now.

"2. With respect to Killroot arrears, it was resolved, that as it appeared, by papers under Mr. Brice's hand, a considerable part of said arrear has been paid in barley given the Rev. Mr. Cobham, by Mr. Brice's tenants, at his mother's desire and his, and though the Presbytery have been informed that Mr. Brice, some time ago, allowed said barley to be a gift, yet, as he gives it under his hand that it is to be charged, these papers are to be admitted, and the value of the barley deducted out of the arrear, unless the contrary appear by a letter from Mr. Brice.

"3. As Dobbsland arrear is pretty plain, nothing need be said about it.

"4. As to the grassing charged by Magheramorne, if they prove that the late Rev. Mr. Cobham had the number of sums grazed which they mention, and that Mr. Wilson allowed these sums to be grazed as an equivalent for stipend, it ought to be allowed.

"5. As to the general proposal that all who owe stipend ought to pay it up, that can bear no dispute. And as to the arrear which they say there are no persons now living by whom it was due, and therefore ought not to be charged according to law or equity, the Presbytery have always looked upon every Congregation as a united body, and if arrears fall upon individuals, and they die, the Congregation of which they were members are not to make the

minister and his family the only sufferers, it being easier for a considerable number to bear such loss by paying it amongst them, than the minister or his family to sustain the loss of all.

"6. As to the arrears upon Ballyhill, the Presbytery hope, and would fondly believe, there will be no difficulty from that quarter.

"7. The Presbytery were not a little surprised at the charge of £77 10s. for ploughing. As this was never mentioned in Mr. Cobham's lifetime, he no doubt looked upon any service of this kind beyond their covenant* as a compliment. And besides, many of the Presbytery have heard him complain that his farm was not laboured in due season, nor sufficiently done at all. For these reasons, such an indecent charge as above should not have been made. But at the same time, the Presbytery think Mr. Cobham should make some allowance, as the people may find some difficulty in paying all the arrears due upon them. The Presbytery also think that Mr. James Cobham and the people of Broadisland Congregation should have a meeting; and if he and they desire it, some ministers will meet with them, compromise all these matters, and fix upon the sum which he will be willing to take and they pay. These resolutions to be read in the Congregation of Broadisland, and a copy of them given to Mr. James Cobham. Supplies appointed for Broadisland.

"BELFAST, Nov. 3, 1761. From Broadisland appeared John Clark and Alex. Gillespy, Commissioners, supplicating that this Presbytery would procure Mr. John Murray from the Presbytery of Ballymena, to supply them four Lord's days, as soon as possible, and that they be supplied the remainder of the time until next meeting in the ordinary way. That Congregation also referred the Presbytery to their Commissioners for information of the state of their affairs. The Commissioners were asked if the resolutions of the Presbytery at their last meeting had been observed. They replied that they waited on Mr. James Cobham, and proposed to leave all the accounts between him and their Congregation (the several charges formerly mentioned included) to the arbitration of four ministers and two lay gentlemen. To this he replied, Give him a sum of the arrear due, and then he would tell them what he would do. The Commissioners also informed the Presbytery, that upon comparing their accounts with that of the late Mr. Cobham's books, since the year 1749, for that division of their Congregation called Magheramorne, they had no exception against said books. They also informed the Presbytery that £14 were due the Probationers. The several parts of this information being carefully considered, the Presbytery unanimously agreed to grant the supplication from Broadisland; and at the same time observed to the Commissioners (which they are to report to their constituents) that though they have been gratified at the time, they must not expect that any further steps will be taken towards fixing a minister among them, until their Congregation be brought into a more regular situation than at present it appears to be in; and it was warmly recom-

* Congregations were generally bound to do a certain proportion of the minister's farm-work, in addition to the stipend which they were to pay.

mended to them that they would speedily pay the Probationers what they owed them, which is shamefully due. Mr. Fullerton was appointed to write to the Rev. Presbytery of Ballymena, that they may be pleased to appoint Mr. Murray to attend a Committee of the following brethren, viz., Messrs. Fullerton, Montgomery, and Rodgers, the 20th instant, at Ballynure, and preach a Subjection Sermon before them, in order that they may appoint him to Broadisland the two last Sabbaths of this month and the two first in December next.

"*Second Session, Wednesday, at 12 o'clock, forenoon.* After prayer, &c., &c., as a report prevails that the credentials upon which Mr. Murray had been admitted as a preacher of the General Synod were forged, this Presbytery agreed to recal our letter to the Rev. Presbytery of Ballymena for him to supply Broadisland, until that matter be cleared up; and that Congregation is to be supplied until next meeting in the usual way.

"BALLYNURE, *Jan. 20, 1762.*—Broadisland: thence appeared William Kerly,* who informed the Presbytery that he and John Blair were appointed to attend at this meeting with a supplication in writing for Messrs. Leathes and Barbor to supply that Congregation until next meeting. John Blair, nor any written supplication from Broadisland, did not appear. The Presbytery, though they did not suspect the truth of William Kerly's information, agreed not to appoint the above-named gentlemen the whole time until next meeting; but willing to do everything in their power to oblige that people, have appointed Mr. Barbor four Sabbaths, and they are to be supplied the rest of the time by ministers and Probationers.

"TEMPLEPATRICK, *April 20, 1762.*—As the Congregation of Broadisland have appointed no Commissioners to attend at this meeting, the Presbytery resolved that Mr. Fullerton shall preach to that people next Sabbath, and inform them that they are not to expect supplies for time to come if they do not apply for them properly; and that it is expected they will pay off speedily the supply money due the Probationers, as it is a great injustice to detain it so long from them; and that Mr. Rodgers shall appoint the Probationers in their turn to that Congregation, provided they (the Congregation) desire Mr. Fullerton to write him to that purpose, and engage to pay them speedily what is due.

"ANTRIM, *June 29, 1762.*—Broadisland: thence appeared Alex. Gillespy and John Horsborough, Commissioners, supplicating that the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper may be administered to that Congregation as soon as may be convenient, and to grant whatever they may desire that shall appear reasonable to the Presbytery. Resolved, that the Lord's Supper be administered to the people of Broadisland the fourth Sabbath of July next, by Messrs. Thomp-

* Grandfather, I believe, of the late Rev. James Carley, of Antrim, whose forefathers for many generations lived in Killroot (within the bounds of Ballycarry Congregation), where he himself was born. Mr. Carley told me that it was on his grandfather's farm that the French, under Thurot, landed in 1760; and that his father, who was then a little boy, was obliged to act as their guide from Killroot to Carrickfergus.

son, Rodgers, and Fullerton. Mr. Barbor to preach at Lairne, Mr. Craford at Ballynure, Mr. Dick at Carriekfergus. Mr. Read to preach at Ballycarry the third Sabbath of July, and Mr. Dunbar the fast day.

"The Commissioners also requested that the Presbytery would advise Mr. James Cobham to choose some gentlemen, and they would choose others, to whom the arbitration of the differences between him and them should be left. This was also granted; and Mr. Rodgers was appointed to recommend this proposal in a letter to Mr. Cobham, and Mr. Fullerton is ordered to converse with Mr. Cobham, and urge him to a compliance with this request.

"LAIRNE, *August 17, 1762.*—Inquiry was made if Mr. Rodgers had wrote to Mr. Cobham as appointed, and he produced a letter from Mr. Cobham, from which it appeared that he was satisfied to allow the affair of the arrear to be considered by some gentlemen, provided the people of Broadisland would inform him what it was they desired to be referred, and the person or persons to whom they will refer the matter. The Presbytery recommended it to the people of Broadisland to draw up a state of their case; in it to mention the matters they want to refer, and the names of the gentlemen whom they will appoint arbitrators, and send the account of these things to the Clerk of Presbytery, by him to be transmitted to Mr. Cobham that the desired reference may be fixed.

"BALLYNURE, *Dec. 21, 1762.*—A letter from Archibald Edminstone, Esq., was read, wherein he requests that the Presbytery would interpose their authority to bring Mr. James Cobham to reason and equity with respect to the insolvent (*sic*) arréars charged on the Congregation of Broadisland, that they may have a minister speedily fixed amongst them. A letter from Mr James Cobham was also read, wherein he complains of great injustice done him and the memory of his father by the people of Broadisland, who by not paying the arrear stipend fixed before, and soon after, his father's death, as recorded in the Presbytery's Minutes, have put it out of his power to execute his father's will; and prays that the Presbytery would use their influence to bring said Congregation to do justice. He said that little more than one year's stipend had been paid since his father's death, and complains that very indiscreet and unbecoming methods had been used by that people to discharge the arrears by them,—such as making a charge for grazing, and some other things which they say his father received as stipend; though that cannot appear, as these things were never brought into any stated account to his father, the Presbytery, or to him. He declares his hearty inclination that the Congregation of Broadisland may be fixed in a minister;* and in order to that, he says that if they allow him the profits of the farm possessed by his father,—and which, he alleges, as an executor he had a right to occupy until the arrears were discharged,—and the residue of the annual stipend after paying the Probationers, he would give the Congregation a full discharge for the arrears they now owe. The

* Which, by Presbyterian law, they could not be, until they got a clear discharge from the representatives of their late minister for all stipend due to him at his decease.

Commissioners from Broadisland, upon hearing Mr. Cobham's proposal, agreed to it, provided that by the stipend he meant £36 a year.

"Mr. Fullerton was appointed to answer Mr. Edmonstone, and assure him that the Presbytery will do everything in their power obliging to him and serviceable to the Congregation of Broadisland, particularly with respect to their being speedily fixed in a minister.

"CARRICKFERGUS, February 8, 1763.—Broadisland. The Commissioners produced a discharge from Mr. James Cobham, for all stipend due him, as executor of his late father."

The road is now at length clear for the settlement of the fourth Minister of Broadisland, Mr. Bankhead.

(To be continued.)

THE LORD'S SUPPER: ITS NATURE AND OBJECT.

THE injunction or request of our blessed Lord, uttered in that solemn meeting with his disciples on the Thursday evening before his death, has been always regarded as intended, not merely for those who then formed the company of chosen ones, but for all in all succeeding ages who should acknowledge him as the Christ,—the anointed one,—whom the Father sent to be the Saviour of the world. Hence we find that this Supper of the Lord has been kept in almost every section into which the Christian Church has been divided and subdivided. The wisest and best Christians have differed—and too often have angrily disputed—respecting the interpretation of the Scriptures and the doctrines of Christianity; but they have wonderfully agreed in recognizing this injunction of their common Master, and keeping this simple and expressive feast "in remembrance of him."

The Lord's Supper is a religious rite. Rites and ceremonies are often formal and powerless, and hence the tendency of an enlightened age to shake them off; and hence many in the most powerful Churches in these kingdoms, though still retaining their connexion with them, have outgrown the ceremonies they impose. But no progress in religion, and no advance in knowledge, lead men who cherish a religious spirit beyond this touching and beautifully significant rite. As the piety of children would lead them to the grave of a parent, and move them

there to more earnest reflection on the virtue of the departed, and on the blessings which they derive from a mother's lessons or a father's example ; as the gratitude of those who are living in a free land and under free institutions would lead them to contemplate the scenes in which the battles of liberty had been won, and to muse at the tomb or the monument of revered patriots ; so do those who are grateful for the spiritual—and we might also add the temporal—blessings they have derived from Christ, gladly avail themselves of a feast which is more suggestive of their Redeemer than the hill of Calvary or the Holy Sepulchre. Not one in ten thousand of those who receive Jesus, and believe in him as the Christ of God, could visit the land in which he lived, and muse over the spots which tradition points out as most interesting in connexion with his life and his death ; but to this memorial rite the humblest can come without inconvenience or toil.

The bread and the wine, apart entirely from mysterious changes which superstition has fancied to be made on them, represent the death of Christ ; and in partaking of them in the Communion, we are led to meditate on the ignominious and agonizing death which our Lord meekly and submissively met for sake of a sinful world, that thus he might give repentance to men and the remission of their sins. The direct purpose of the rite is, in the language of the Sacred Record, “to show forth the Lord's death.” We have thus suggested to us the deep love of Christ. He understood, as we cannot, the manifold evils that flowed upon mankind from sin ; he saw, as we may not, that sin is the great source of misery to our race ; and therefore to take away sin he was willing to lay down his life. If the Jews could reasonably say, as they saw Jesus weeping at the grave of Lazarus, “Behold how he loved him !” how well may we exclaim, as here we contemplate the emblems of his death, Behold how he loved the world !

We here signify our interest in religion ; our sense of its value. True, we do not always feel its supreme importance, or enter fully into the meaning of our Lord when says—“One thing is needful ;” but in seasons of solemn meditation, as in times of deep distress, it is to be

hoped that we do. And Christ represents our religion : in him seem to concentrate our duties, our consolations, our hopes. In thus remembering Christ, we acknowledge the value of religion to direct us amid the temptations of life, and lead us in the paths of duty ; to bring comfort to our souls in seasons of sorrow and bereavement ; and to give us hope, amid the transient scenes of earth, of a purer and more enduring life to come.

The Lord's Supper is spread for all who love Jesus Christ. It is not intended for a particular class, to the exclusion of others : it is designed for all who value his Gospel and desire to obey it ; for all who acknowledge him as the Saviour and desire to follow him. There is here erected no Church test. No Confession of Faith meets us, demanding our assent before we break the hallowed bread or taste the hallowed cup. Some of those who keep the feast will have a deeper love, a stronger faith than others. Some will have a more fervent piety : but the superiority of some does not render others less welcome. At the table at which this memorial rite was first instituted, all who kept it were not on the same level of faith, devotion, and charity. Peter had less of charity than John, and Thomas less of faith than either. The rite is to be regarded, not as a symbol of Christian perfection, but as an aid to Christian progress. If only those who hold a pure faith and possess a perfect life should acceptably partake, then who of any Church might keep it ? Rather do we need its observance, because we feel how weak is our faith and how imperfect is our Christian character.

Some, there is reason to fear, shrink from acknowledging Christ in this rite, because they suppose that they thus incur new obligations. By keeping this feast we profess ourselves Christians—not perfect Christians, but disciples of Christ, learners at the feet of Jesus. And it would be a shameful inconsistency to make that profession one day, and the next to seek those pleasures, or pursue those practices, or harbour those unholy feelings, regarding which the religion of Christ says, “Thou shalt not.” But those who refrain from this feast are no less under obligations to keep the commandments of Christ. Our duties do not spring from the particular profession

we make, but they arise out of the faculties God has bestowed on us, the relations in which he has placed us, and the light which he has given us in conscience, and in the Gospel of Christ. No profession we here make increases our obligations to love God and to love man, to turn from evil and to do good. But while thus we do not add to our obligations, we may gain new strength to fulfil them; and therefore did our Lord graciously appoint this memorial feast, that our remembrance of him might be from time to time renewed, and that his word and spirit might live in our hearts.

For the aged that table is spread. Very soon they must leave this earth, and its cares and concerns, and cross the river of death. How much strength and comfort they may gather from him who calmly regarded death,—spoke of it as a sleep, and pointed the disciples to the Father's home and its many mansions. For the young that table is spread, that there they may meditate on him whose word is their only safe and sure guide amid the temptations of life. You are inexperienced; those who are older and wiser will tell you that the religion of Christ is your best directory. Here confess him, and seek God's blessing, that you may be enabled to follow him. Those who have passed through afflictions, and thus have had their hearts weaned from the world, should thoughtfully remember him through whom God gives to the sorrowing and the suffering promises so cheering, and consolations so precious. And those who are happy in their homes, and prosperous in their life should, in that rite, contemplate the Saviour of the world. His Word will direct them aright; his Spirit will bless them in their prosperity, and when their sun shall be darkened, and the days of sorrow come, they will have his presence to sustain and comfort them.

And for all, as sinners, that table is spread, setting forth him whose blood was shed for the remission of sin; for all, as frail and perishing mortals, it is spread, setting forth him through whose Gospel life and immortality are brought to light. Communion seasons come round at lengthened intervals: no Christian should lightly regard them, or suffer trivial causes to keep him away. To all the Lord's Supper is free, but we should not, on that

account, come to it thoughtlessly or irreverently. What freedom, and at the same time what solemnity, is embodied in the exhortation of the Apostle Paul—"Let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of this bread and drink of this cup."

WHAT THE SCRIPTURES TEACH.—No. 4.

THE Scriptures teach us that while our Lord was on earth his disciples honoured and revered him: but that after his resurrection and ascension they entertained for him a vastly greater reverence; for then they knew that God had highly exalted him, and had given him a name above every name: that in the name of Jesus every knee should bow, . . . and every tongue confess that he is Lord, to the glory of God, the Father (Phil. ii. 9—11); but they do not teach that Christians should worship him as God. Careless readers of the Gospel are often led into error by the reference sometimes made to men worshipping Christ; but they should consider that "worship," at the time when our Scriptures were translated, was used in a much wider and looser sense than we now employ it. This will be evident by observing that servants are said to worship their masters (Matt. xviii. 26); and those who are spoken of as worshipping Christ were sometimes not even his disciples, and they did not know him as the Christ (Matt. viii. 2; ix. 18).

The disciples are described as worshipping our Lord at the time of his ascension; and a sacred writer speaks of the angels as worshipping him, not however as God, but as the only-begotten Son of God (Luke xxiv. 52; Heb. i. 6). It is to be regretted that in our translation of the Scriptures a distinction is not preserved which is very plainly made in the original, where the words specially employed to express *divine* worship are never employed to express the homage and reverence paid to Christ.

So far are the Scriptures from teaching us to worship our Lord, that they expressly tell us not to pray to him (John xvi. 23). These are the words of Christ himself. It is true that Stephen appears to speak in prayer to his Lord; but it is to be borne in mind that he saw him, and

most naturally besought him to receive his spirit, not as God, but as that Mediator through whom he knew God, and in whose cause he had been put to a cruel death (Acts vii. 59). The Christians are spoken of as those "who called on the name of the Lord," evidently meaning Christ; but the word rendered "calling on the name" signifies "looking to for help," or "appealing to," and thus happily expresses their relation to the Saviour. In him is our help. The Scriptures never teach us to pray to Christ, but everywhere to pray to God our Father in his name.

AN ELDER VINDICATED.

WHEN some months ago it was publicly stated, in reference to an Elder of the Presbytery of Antrim, and a prominent member of one of its Congregations, that it was the design of himself and others "to build up a Church which should not be exclusively Christian in any sense—which would admit Christians, Deists, Pantheists, Hindoos, and Mahometans"—many who had hitherto regarded those who, with characteristic modesty, designate themselves "the Liberal Party," as merely struggling against the imposition of Creeds, were startled, and confidently expected that at a meeting of the Presbytery of Antrim, which took place a few days after, an indignant protest would be entered against principles so wild and unchristian. But that meeting passed over, and another three months after, and still no step was taken to vindicate their Christian reputation. This mysterious silence was the more extraordinary, as we are sure that many who have been dragged along by the cry of "Liberty" have no sympathy whatever with such reckless views, and would shrink from the idea of being instrumental in promoting unbelief in any form. Very lately, however, symptoms of a counteracting movement have been manifested, and one minister has intimated that it is "unfair and improper to try to fasten obloquy on the religious body with which he is connected by reason of any expression of an individual member." We freely admit that individual members of a Church may hold extrava-

gant and eccentric opinions for which the body is in no way answerable; but if the principles of the Church be avowedly such as to admit the views professed by a leading member, the obloquy should not be fastened on the individual, but on the Church to which he consistently belongs. And thus we think it is in the case under consideration, and therefore do we venture to write in vindication of one whom his fellow-members may possibly be inclined to disown.

A distinguished minister of the Presbytery of Antrim, some time ago, in explaining, in an American newspaper, the leading principles of the body, stated that their essential bond of union was *free inquiry*. Now he is too liberal to suppose that all free inquiry must result in the adoption of his own opinions; he will admit that some, in the exercise of this right of free inquiry, have adopted Trinitarian, and others Unitarian views; some have become Deists, others Pantheists, and others Atheists; nor is it any unreasonable stretch of imagination to suppose that some have, from what they believed to be careful investigation, embraced the Jewish, or the Mahomedan faith: and it thus follows, on the authority of the very gentleman who regards it as unjust to fasten obloquy on his Church on account of the opinions of an individual member, that the Elder's principles are those of the Church itself, and that by its constitution it is "in no sense exclusively Christian."

A similar defence of the Elder's ideas of his Church might be drawn from the declaration of another minister of the same body, who, on a more recent occasion, alleged, in a public meeting at Moneyrea, that "*absolute religious liberty was the principle of the Presbytery of Antrim.*" Now we admire absolute religious liberty as much as most of our neighbours do; and we are thankful that it is, as far as practicable, the principle of our National Government. Men in this free land are at liberty to hold, profess, and advocate any religious views which they believe to be true. Even men like Holyoake and Joseph Barker are free to teach, in public lectures and through the press, their chilling and dangerous opinions: but surely a moment's reflection will satisfy any one that absolute religious liberty in a Christian Church is absolute nonsense.

It may be that the speaker referred to did not mean all he said, but so long as "free inquiry" and "absolute religious liberty" are avowed by leading members as the principles of their Church, they are not in a position to find fault with the Elder who candidly declared "It was our design to build up a Church which should not be exclusively Christian, in any sense—which would admit Christians, Deists, Pantheists, Hindoos, and Mahometans."

We do not believe that the ministers, whose public statements we have noticed, had any idea of the very extravagant length to which their avowed principles led, and it will give us unfeigned pleasure to find them so modifying them as to replace the ancient and venerable Presbytery of Antrim on the basis of Divine Revelation, on which its honoured founders established it.

REVIEW.

THE NEW THEOLOGY: *A Lecture delivered in the Church of the First Presbyterian Congregation, Belfast. With an Appendix.* By JOHN SCOTT PORTER. Pp. 28.

WE welcome the publication of this Lecture, not only on account of the exposition which is given of those sceptical opinions which, in one form or another, have been latterly adopted by professing Christians, and have even been introduced into Christian pulpits, but also, as it affords a simple and satisfactory reply to the unjust attacks which, in the columns of *The London Inquirer*, and elsewhere, have been made on the able and accomplished author.

Mr. Porter first states, in a few sentences, the leading principles of the Gospel which our blessed Lord proclaimed, and which his apostles preached. "That Jesus is the Christ, the Messiah, the Anointed of God, His chosen messenger and special ambassador to our race,—that he spoke God's Word, and revealed God's mind to the children of men, is the very *foundation-stone* of the

Church, as it was planned and built up by the first propagators of the Gospel." *The Inquirer* will object to the figure employed in this statement, and gravely argue that Christianity is *not built upon a stone at all?* The old theology, propounded by Christ and his apostles, does indeed teach that the Church of Christ is built on a *rock*, and that Christ himself is the chief *corner-stone*, but the disciples of the New Theology, of which *The Inquirer* is the ready and reckless abettor, discard all such old-fashioned notions.

Mr. Porter then explains the leading principles of the New Theology,—shewing that they are, in reality, not “new”—that they are old opinions, held by the Deistical writers of the last century in England,—that from England they passed over to France, where they were disseminated by Voltaire, and others, and hence spread into Germany. While the theologians of this “advanced” school of thought have differed among themselves, it has been “a settled principle with them that *neither inspiration nor revelation from God, neither prophecy nor miracle, nor anything out of the ordinary course of nature, is possible, or can be believed by any thinking man.*”

We would gladly, did our space permit, make copious extracts from Mr. Porter’s Lecture, to shew the various schemes which have been adopted by different parties in explaining away the leading facts in the Gospel narrative; and to exhibit the Atheistical principles which have been propounded by some of the leaders of this school: we hope, however, that our readers will peruse the Lecture itself. One passage only we shall quote, shewing the light in which the author regards those who hold such opinions:—

“I do not hesitate to declare that I look upon these opinions as ‘*another Gospel*.’ and I cannot regard the men who hold them as Christian ministers or Christian men. They may call themselves Christians if they please. Why—looking upon Christ in the light in which they view him—they should wish to call themselves by his name, I cannot see. But that is a question entirely for themselves. It seems to me very like ‘betraying the Son of Man with a kiss.’ Still, if they choose to assume his name, it is equally beyond my power and my province to prevent them. *But no power on earth shall ever compel me to apply to them that name!* Their sentiments are, to my mind, purely *anti-christian*; not only

different from those which Christ taught, but opposed to the authority which he claimed; calculated and intended to uproot all respect for his office and his religion from the minds of men. I am not at all disposed to take a confined view of the Christian character, or to narrow the terms of ministerial or of Christian communion. Shew me a man who accepts Jesus as a divine teacher, and the Gospel as a divine revelation, and I acknowledge him as a fellow-Christian, be he Catholic or Protestant, Trinitarian or Unitarian, Calvinist or Arminian, Arian or Humanitarian,—whatever be the peculiarities of his Church or creed. But I cannot welcome as fellow-labourers those who make it the aim and object of all their endeavours to tear up the foundations of the Christian Church.”

The subject of this Lecture is one in which, as Christian Unitarians, we are deeply concerned. Mr. Porter mentions that one minister who, some years ago, occupied a Unitarian pulpit in England, admitted to him that he was a Pantheist; and that another minister, who was lately a candidate for a vacant Unitarian Congregation in the neighbourhood of Belfast, stated to him, that Hegel (whose opinions were decidedly Atheistical) was the greatest philosopher that ever lived. The fact, also mentioned in the Lecture, that Mr. Binns of Birkenhead, and Mr. Wright of Bury, have been labouring to circulate Theodore Parker’s writings in England and Ireland, is familiar to our readers, for we have more than once referred to it: and we know, from information received from the most authentic sources, that Deism, under the name of Parkerism, largely affects some of the Unitarian Congregations of Great Britain and the United States. Its prevalence in England is indeed painfully manifested by the fact, that the two weekly journals connected with the body lend their influence towards its dissemination, while the other periodicals generally maintain a timid silence.

The Appendix contains much that is particularly interesting, and calculated to enlighten the reader, both on the general subject, and on local matters bearing on it. The paragraphs entitled “The Barrier Broken,” “Theodore Parker,” and “My Critics,” are especially instructive. The notice which is taken of *The Inquirer* and its Belfast correspondent must show them the futility of their criticisms, and convince them that, in their venomous assaults upon Mr. Porter, they are only *biting a file*.

DR. MONTGOMERY AND THE LATE REV. F. BLAKLEY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CHRISTIAN UNITARIAN.

DEAR SIR,—During the last seven years I have been subjected “to a tempest of evil tongues,” on account of my unwavering fidelity to the Fundamental Principles of the Remonstrant Synod of Ulster; and my fixed resolve, in accordance with these principles, never to open the pulpits of that *Christian Church* to the stealthy intrusion of *Deism or Atheism*, under the abused name of Liberty. Not content with the foulest misrepresentation of my *opinions*, my unscrupulous enemies, some time ago, made a deadly thrust at my *moral reputation*—representing me as ungenerous and vindictive, in regard to my old friend and fellow-labourer, the late *Fletcher Blakely*. Their evident calculation was, that I would tamely submit to *any* amount of abuse, rather than defend myself by a simple statement of facts which would show that I had been his life-long benefactor, and that, even under very strong provocation, I had *actually proved* my readiness to forgive in one case, and was willing to show the same placability under circumstances of still greater aggravation. My defence necessarily involved the publication of some details which I should rather have suppressed; but my detractors, who compelled me to give them, were alone to blame; and I am gratified to know that some of the most intelligent relatives of my good friend considered my statement as at once candid, honourable, and kind. As a matter of course, the unhappy men who calculated on injuring me, and through *me* the great cause which I have espoused, became infuriated at the failure of their schemes, and have assailed me with a malignity and falsehood never equalled, I believe, in the annals of Billingsgate. I rejoice that, in the exercise of “a dignified impartiality,” you have given full scope to their slanders; for although *their* periodicals refuse the insertion of any Articles, either defensive or explanatory, from us, it is well that our friends should see the spirit, the principles, and the capabilities of the special “advocates of religious progress.”

You are aware, however, that for upwards of six weeks I have been seriously indisposed, and that I am still able to do little more than leave my bed. My medical advisers, consequently, absolutely forbid at present all avoidable labour either of body or mind; and so soon as my Communion shall be over next month, I must seek the restoration of my health in England or elsewhere. The Rev. James Orr, of Clonmel, therefore, who published under the name of *Mary Ann M'Kittrick*, and the Rev. W. Cochrane, who published in his own amiable name some twenty pages of unmitigated and characteristic abuse, will have their merited chastisement deferred until it shall suit my own perfect convenience and pleasure to administer it. In the meantime, I pledge myself to friends and foes that every accusation preferred against me by those miserable men is absolutely unfounded; and that I am able to establish the truth of *every* statement contained in my first Letter by written documents,

living testimony, or notorious facts.—Always, dear Sir, your obedient servant,

H. MONTGOMERY.

DUNMURRY GLEBE, *April 22, 1863.*

[We regret very much the cause which prevents Dr. Montgomery from publishing the rejoinder which he had intended; but it occurs to us that such a reply as he threatens may be rendered unnecessary by our briefly noticing the several matters that have been thrown up in the lengthened and painful correspondence which has appeared in our pages.

Dr. Montgomery and Mr. Blakely were for many years intimate and warmly attached friends: they fought together the great battle against creeds in the General Synod, and they planned and laboured together to build up the Free Church which they had been largely instrumental in forming. The one, by his great ability and commanding eloquence, his genial disposition and generous feelings; the other, by his bold and manly character, his acute intellect, and his warm and honest heart, endeared himself to his friend. They were as brothers. It was quite unnecessary for Dr. M. to enter into any minute statement of money transactions to defend himself against the charge of unkindness. No one believed such a charge, and Mr. B. himself would have been the first to repel it. Unhappily, however, some twelve years ago an estrangement took place, arising out of circumstances which *naturally* pained Mr. B., but which, so far from being discreditable to Dr. M., would, if published, largely redound to his honour. This estrangement continued for some years; and enemies of Dr. M. did much to widen the breach. At length, however, as mentioned by Dr. M., a reconciliation took place. Soon after, a testimonial to Mr. Magennis was set on foot. Mr. B., we believe without having seen the foul calumny against Dr. M. which headed the list, attached his name to it. Other ministers, we know, were led into a similar error. But Dr. M. was justly wounded by Mr. B. appearing to lend his name to give currency and weight to a gross imputation against his character. Matters were in this state when Mr. B. was about to remove to England. He sent his friend, Mr. David Orr, to Dr. M., *to endeavour to make a particular arrangement respecting the payment of his Royal Bounty*, saying, as he went out, that if the Doctor could visit him before he left Ireland, he would be glad to see him. We do not wonder that Dr. M. allowed other engagements to prevent him from going, as there had been no expression of regret for an insult which he believed Mr. B. had cast upon him, and also as he must have known that to one inmate at least of Mr. B.'s house he would have been a most unwelcome visitor. Dr. M.'s enemies greedily seized on this circumstance, and, by exaggerated and distorted representations of it, did their best to injure him. He might very safely, however, have allowed them to talk on, and have given no heed; or, if any notice had been taken, it might have been enough for Mr. Orr to have published *a brief statement of all the facts*. This would have been an ample vindication of Dr. Montgomery: and we would suggest that if anything more is needed to terminate a most unprofitable controversy, it is just such a statement; and if Mr. Cochrane is still anxious to meet any equit-

able claim (which Dr. M., however, does not make), let two intelligent men of business examine the letters on both sides, and say what amount should be paid. Nothing more is necessary, and we hope that nothing more will be written. Dr. M., by his consistent efforts to maintain the Christian character of the Remonstrant Synod, has brought down upon him a torrent of abuse; but it is the penalty which the best men must suffer for their unswerving allegiance to principle and truth. While our Church cherishes a grateful remembrance of the worth, consistency, and valuable services of the late Mr. Blakely, it rejoices that the ablest champion of its principles is still living, and, though in old age, as earnest and anxious as in earlier years for its honour and safety.—
ED. CH. UN.]

INTELLIGENCE.

DOMESTIC MISSION TO THE POOR OF BELFAST.

ON Monday evening, April 20th, the annual meeting of the friends and supporters of the Domestic Mission to the Poor of Belfast was held in the School Rooms, Stanhope Street,—the Rev. W. Bruce, the President of the Society, in the chair. After devotional exercises, the Secretary, Mr. J. M. Darbishire, read the Report of the Committee, and also that of the Ladies' General Committee and Dorcas Society. The Rev. J. S. Porter read the Report on the Schools; and in the absence of the Missionary, the Rev. T. Bowring, who was prevented by illness from attending, Mr. Darbishire read his Report, which gave ample evidence of his zeal in carrying out the objects of the Mission. The Reports were all of a most satisfactory and encouraging character. Their adoption, with the Accounts of the Treasurer, Mr. Andrews, was moved by Mr. Robert Patterson, who dwelt at some length on the important character of the Institution. Mr. B. Mulligan seconded the motion. Dr. Ritchie rose to move an amendment, to the effect "that the Report be referred back to the Committee, for the purpose of appending thereto the statement of reasons for leaving Belfast, submitted to the Committee by their late Missionary, the Rev. H. Eachus." Mr. R. Gordon seconded the amendment; but on its being put from the chair, no one was found to support it except the mover and seconder. The original motion was then carried unanimously. A resolution was passed acknowledging the sense which the subscribers entertained of the value of Mr. Bowring's services as Missionary, their sympathy with him in his late severe illness, and their hope that he may soon be able, with renovated health, to resume his important labours. Office-bearers for the ensuing year were appointed; and the meeting closed with prayer.

[We have not reported Dr. Ritchie's speech in introducing his amendment, or the speeches of Mr. Porter and others in reply. When Dr. R. sent us, some months ago, a statement of the case which he brought before the late meeting, we declined to publish

it, informing him that we would not feel ourselves justified in introducing a discussion which could do no possible good, and might do much harm. We knew the whole facts of the case intimately : we knew that Mr. Eachus had felt himself inconvenienced by certain regulations of the Committee,—made, however, previously to his entering on the office ; and we knew that when he stated his objections, such changes were made as removed any reasonable ground of complaint. The Committee valued his services, and endeavoured in every way in their power to meet his wishes ; and it is only to be regretted that he should have left behind him any statement which was calculated, though we are sure not intended, to create discord in so valuable an institution.—ED. CH. UN.]

ORDINATION AT MONEYREA.

On Tuesday, March 31st, the Presbytery of Antrim met at Moneyrea, to ordain the Rev. John Berryhill as pastor of that Congregation. There was a large attendance of the members of the Congregation, and others. The Rev. J. Jellie conducted the introductory services : the Rev. W. Hall preached from Matt. xxv. 4—“ But the wise took oil in their vessels with their lamps.” The Rev. D. Gordon explained and defended Presbyterian ordination. Mr. Berryhill made a statement of his religious views, and his intentions on entering on the work of the ministry. The Rev. John Porter offered up the ordination prayer ; and the Rev. S. C. Nelson delivered the charge to the minister and Congregation.

At the conclusion of the services, the members of Presbytery, a number of gentlemen belonging to the Congregation, and other friends dined together in the School-room—the Rev. John Porter in the chair. In the evening a Congregational Soiree was held, which was very numerously attended ; Edward Gardiner, Esq., Downpatrick, presided. In the course of the evening various sentiments were given from the chair, and responded to. The Rev. W. Hall spoke to “ Civil and Religious Liberty all the world over ;” the Rev. J. Jellie to “ The memory of the Rev. F. Blakely, our late Pastor ;” the Rev. John Porter to “ The officiating Ministers and the Presbytery of Antrim ;” Mr. Joshua M'Master to “ The Non-Subscribing Congregation of Moneyrea ;” the Rev. D. Gordon to “ The Brotherhood of Man ;” and the Rev. W. O. M'Gowan to “ Sunday-school Education.” Early in the evening the Chairman gave “ The Rev. J. Berryhill, and our earnest wishes for his success and happiness,” to which the newly-ordained minister replied in appropriate and effective terms.

SUNDAY SCHOOL TEACHERS' UNION.

On Tuesday evening, April 14th, a meeting of this Society was held in the Fountain Street School-room, Dr. Young in the chair. After prayer by the Rev. J. Jellie, Robert Patterson, Esq., gave a most interesting and instructive lecture on “ Natural History its Influences, intellectual and moral.” The attendance was large, and although there were many pupils, as well as teachers present, the lecturer seemed to command the attention of all, and interest

and delight them by the important facts he brought forward, and the happy manner in which he illustrated his subject. At the close a vote of thanks, on the motion of Mr. Jellie, seconded by Mr. M'Alester, was very cordially given to Mr. Patterson, and the meeting was closed with prayer.

PRESENTATION TO THE REV. C. J. M'ALESTER.

On Easter Sunday, April 5, a gratifying compliment was paid to the Rev. C. J. M'Alester by the members of his Congregation and other friends, who presented him with an affectionate Address, accompanied by a purse containing £300. At the close of the morning service in the church, on the motion of Mr. Robert Patterson, Mr. David M'Cance, the Treasurer of the Congregation, was moved to the chair; and after a few introductory remarks, he called on Mr. T. B. Johnston the Secretary, to read the Address. Mr. M'Alester replied; and Mr. Patterson and Mr. Malcolm afterwards addressed the meeting. The proceedings were throughout of a most interesting character, and must have been particularly gratifying to Mr. M'Alester.

NEWRY REMONSTRANT CONGREGATION.

On Wednesday evening, April 8th, the Remonstrant Congregation of Newry, entertained the members of the Choir and Sunday-school teachers at a Soiree, in the school-room adjoining the church. About 100 members were present, and the Rev. Henry Alexander presided. After tea, the chairman opened the meeting with an impressive and appropriate address. The Rev. S. Moore, Dr. Connor, Messrs. Robert Greer, Hill Irvine, J.P., James Glenny, and Walter Scott, severally addressed the meeting.

OBITUARY.

Died, at The Cottage, Dunmurry, on April 13, Miss Hunter, aged 88 years.

Died, at Donegall Pass, Belfast, on April 13, Alice Coates M'Kibben, aged 32 years.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

ERRATUM.—In Mr. Cochrane's letter in our last, page 93, 29 lines from top, for "boarding humbly," read "boarding himself."

The Memoir of Mr. M. Scott received, and shall appear in our next.

Communications for the Editor, to be addressed by post to Rev. C. J. M'Alester, Holywood; or, otherwise, to 45, Arthur Street, Belfast.

Orders for the work and business communications to be sent to the Agent of the Unitarian Society, 45, Arthur Street.

THE
CHRISTIAN UNITARIAN.

VOL. II.]

JUNE, 1863.

[No. 5.

FREE INQUIRY.

WE find ourselves existing in a world in which there is much to invite inquiry and to reward research; and God has gifted us with faculties fitted for investigating, and rendered more active and vigorous in proportion as we exercise them. It is reasonable, therefore, that we should use our powers of thought freely and diligently. Any unjust restraint upon them, or any prohibition of their exercise would seem to be a grievous wrong. God has given us powers of body, the exercise of which increases their strength, and, under just and reasonable limitations, contributes largely to our well-being. If our limbs are so fettered that we can move them only in one direction, they gradually become cramped and enfeebled, and so if our intellectual faculties are restricted, they lose much of their vigour and energy. God evidently intended that we should freely use our bodily powers, and as plainly he designed that we should freely exercise our mental faculties. Free Inquiry, not in one department of knowledge merely, but in every department, is reasonable, and, as far as we can judge, is in harmony with the will of God. And results establish the value of Free Inquiry. There was a time in the history of every nation when, by the despotism of the rulers, the superstition of the people, or the tyranny of the priesthood, Free Inquiry was prohibited, and the mind moved only within a restricted circle, and knowledge made no progress. But when, gradually, restriction was removed, and the mind fully investigated the various departments of God's creation, new truths were perceived, important discoveries followed in rapid succession, and the present state of science, and the blessings which it has scattered over the nations, are

a most glorious testimony to the value of Free Inquiry. Without it astronomical and geological, medical, social, and political science would be very much in the state in which they were in earlier times, when free investigation was deemed profanity; and we would be in ignorance of those ennobling and beneficent truths which have so largely contributed to elevate and bless our country and our age.

If in other departments of knowledge the mind is to exercise Free Inquiry, then we argue that it should especially do so in religion,—in those matters that pertain to God and to duty; for confessedly no other subject is so important, none so deeply interesting; and if it be our duty to employ our mind freely in investigating God's works, and seeking out plans for the promotion of our comfort and happiness, it surely devolves on us to employ the powers of thought which God has graciously given us, to seek out Himself that we may adore and obey him. When we open the Gospel, which we regard as God's fullest revelation of himself and his will, we find no restriction imposed on the human mind, but men are addressed and appealed to as thinking beings. Thus Paul says, "Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind." And again he says, "I speak as unto wise men, judge ye what I say;" while his conduct is in harmony with his doctrine. He reasons with the rulers and the people, he labours to persuade them: he does not denounce or tyrannize; neither does he threaten all who differ from him with future and eternal damnation. And a greater than Paul—he whom Paul sought most faithfully to serve—exhibited the same spirit. He reasoned and persuaded, but never tyrannized; he wielded the power which God had given him, not to oppress but to convince the multitudes. He entreated and besought them to follow him, but never compelled them. We know, indeed, that the Gospel of Christ was, in past ages, so far misunderstood as to be made the instrument of tyranny and oppression, of cruelty and persecution. In the name of Christ the people were robbed of their rights, multitudes were plundered, imprisoned, exiled; many were cruelly put to death, and more were consigned to a living death in the dungeon. But the Gospel, rightly in-

terpreted, gives no sanction to such injustice, and its spirit is the spirit of peace and of free inquiry; and we should be thankful that in our own land all restrictions to freedom of thought have been swept away, and men are at liberty, not in matters of science merely, but of religion also, to exercise the utmost liberty, and not only to hold, but to express and advocate, whatever opinions they believe to be true.

There is, of course, an obvious limitation to such liberty. Men have freedom of action, but that freedom is not absolute; they are not at liberty to injure their neighbours; and if any one, forcibly prevented from doing violence to his fellow-man, should cry out that his freedom was interfered with, we would regard him as a fool or a madman. Men have all reasonable liberty, but not liberty to murder or to rob, to insult or to slander their fellow-men. So, in the exercise of freedom of thought, they may adopt whatever views they believe to be right; but if, through eccentricity or aberration of mind, any should adopt the opinion that it is their duty to God to punish, as his enemies, all who do not embrace their own particular faith, the State would very properly interfere, and they would be fools if, on this account, they should complain that their liberty was interfered with, and that in this boasted land of freedom, men were not allowed to act upon their convictions!

The exercise of Free Inquiry in reference to the Gospel has led to the adoption of various and conflicting opinions. Many, by a patient investigation of the evidences, external and internal, on which it rests, have been satisfied of its Divine authority, and have therefore received its teachings as the truth of God; and among these are some of the most gifted minds of the past ages and the present. Others, by a similar exercise of the mind, have come to the conclusion that the Gospel has no claim to be regarded as a Divine revelation, but that it contains the history of a remarkable Jew named Jesus, round whose good and earnest life legends of the miraculous in the course of time gathered, and that he had no divine mission, and that his words possessed no more authority than those of other good men. Now, it is true that those who come to the latter conclusion are deprived

of the light and consolation which the Gospel brings to the believer, and they may on this account be the objects of our pity ; but they are not to be blamed, and they are entitled to all the privileges of the State and all the courtesies of private life which others enjoy. To frown upon them, shun them, or denounce them because of their carefully-formed and honourably-entertained opinions would be unjust, and would certainly be a violation of the sacred principle of Free Inquiry.

In the study of the Gospel and its history, different minds, agreeing in its divine authority, have arrived at different conclusions. Some have embraced the opinion that the authority of the Church is vested in the Pope and his Cardinals, and that it is their duty to submit their minds to their dictation. So far it is true that they abandon freedom of thought, but they do so voluntarily in the exercise, may we not say, of Free Inquiry. Such persons are members of the Church of Rome—a Church which has done much in the history of Europe to humanize and improve the world, and much, too, to oppress and enslave it. Those who acknowledge allegiance to the Pope cannot consistently contend within the pale of the Church for more freedom than its principles allow ; they may have more freedom if they desire by leaving the Church, and there is no necessity for their remaining in it if their conscience tells them they should leave. But how unreasonable that man would be who would profess its principles, and yet claim more freedom than they give !

At one time the great mass of the people in Christian countries were connected with the Church of Rome, and were content to be so. But at length some desired more liberty, and in the exercise of Free Inquiry they came to the conclusion that the Church was in error. They contended for the right of individual judgment in interpreting the Gospel, and hence they dissented from the Church and took the name of Protestants. Some of these Protestants adopted certain interpretations of Scripture embodied in Thirty-Nine Articles and in a Book of Common Prayer, and formed the organization to which we give the name of the Church of England and Ireland by law established. Now they had a right to adopt such prin-

ciples as they believed to be true as a bond of union, although we do not think they were right in taking the means which they did for the establishment of their religion. In the exercise of Free Inquiry they adopted these views, and agreed to make them a basis of union. If others dissented from them they had a right to do so ; but for a long series of years the spirit of Free Inquiry was grossly violated by the persecution with which all dissent was visited. Another body of Protestants, associated on different principles, adopting the Westminster Confession of Faith as their rule of doctrine, and joining for the maintenance and extension of Christianity as thus interpreted : and if in the exercise of Free Inquiry they were led to believe that these were the genuine principles of the Gospel, they had a perfect right to organize a Church on that foundation, and to unite for the dissemination of views which they regarded as calculated to promote the present and eternal good of man. But when they taught that the civil magistrate had a right to use the sword for the extirpation of heresy, they went directly against the principles of Free Inquiry, and so far they are to be condemned.

The Protestant organizations to which we have referred, and others similar in their constitution, regarded the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament as at least containing a divine revelation, and as possessing an authority which did not pertain to their Articles, Canons, or Confessions ; and while they required those who were admitted to their society to subscribe, or to signify their assent to, such Articles, other Protestants joined in an organization based simply on the reception of the Scriptures as their rule of faith, and hence called themselves Non-Subscribers. While Non-Subscribers in reference to such Articles, they were thorough subscribers to the authority of Scripture, and the divine revelation which it contains. Each member of their Church was at liberty to interpret the Scriptures, and gather from them what he believed to be God's revelation ; but if in the exercise of Free Inquiry he should arrive at the conclusion that these Scriptures possess no authority, he was bound as an honest man to withdraw from a Church whose principles he no longer held ; and the spirit of Free Inquiry

would only be violated if, because of the views which he conscientiously adopted, he was subjected to insult or injury. Any man has the same right to deny that others have to affirm these principles, but those only who hold them can be consistent members of "the Non-Subscribing Church."

A Christian Church is an organization for worship and instruction in accordance with certain principles of religion which those who adopt them believe to be true and in harmony with the Word of God: and no man can be a member of such a Church, if in the exercise of his judgment he is led to reject its principles. A Total Abstinence Association is an organization for the advocacy and spread of the principles of Total Abstinence; and if any one should arrive at the conclusion (not a very rare one) that men in health should use intoxicating drinks moderately, he may be a very worthy man, but he is quite disqualified for membership in a Total Abstinence Society. Let us imagine a Temperance Society in which one of the leading members should stand on the platform, and advocate Free Inquiry thus: "Our principle is Total Abstinence, but in our Association if any think that they may freely use wine, ale, brandy, or whiskey, they are at liberty to do so; for we reverence Free Inquiry, and welcome to our ranks all earnest thinkers, no matter what opinions they hold." Such licentiousness in opinion, such trifling with principle, would speedily sap the foundation of the Society and destroy it. A certain Church organization is Non-Subscribing; it rejects all human creeds, and holds up the Scriptures as the sole rule of faith. Let us suppose the rulers of this Association saying—"We maintain the Scriptures as our rule of faith to the rejection of all human articles; but we are advocates of Free Inquiry, and therefore welcome all inquirers, whether they believe in our principles or not." Such an admission would be the ruin of the Church. We can imagine enlightened and honest men saying—"The principles of our Non-Subscribing forefathers suited well enough for their day, but in the progress of knowledge we have been led to think less of the Scriptures than they did; they contain many good precepts, but they contain no divine revelation: we shall therefore displace

them from the foundation of our Church, and put in their stead Free Inquiry." There has been no formal abrogation of the great Christian and Protestant principle—the Scriptures our rule of faith,—but there has been a virtual abandonment of it enunciated recently by the Moderator of the Presbytery of Antrim; for he has published to the world this extraordinary declaration—" *Our essential bond of union is Free Inquiry.*"* A very attractive phrase this is for the unthinking, but a monstrously absurd principle. Free Inquiry could be no bond of union for any Church, but would be its practical destruction.

It has, indeed, been declared by a gentleman who, we blush to think, has sometimes appeared as an elder in the Presbytery of Antrim—that Presbytery which, till recently, was distinguished not less for its Christian principles than its religious freedom—"It was our design to build up a Church which should not be exclusively Christian in any sense—which would admit Christians, Deists, Pantheists, Hindoos, and Mahomedans."† But the absurdity of such a project should be patent to everyone. Such a motley assemblage might profitably meet to hear a lecture on Chemistry or Geology, on Temperance or the Emancipation of the Slave; but they could not meet for worship, nor could they unite for the promotion of any principles save those which they held in common. Think of Paul organizing such a Church—or Christ himself—abandoning the great truths which Paul preached, and which Christ revealed for the salvation of the world!

Men sometimes imagine that if others would exercise the freedom which they have used they would arrive at the same results; but facts teach the reverse. Some by inquiry become Deists, some Pantheists, and some Atheists; some Christians of one sect and some of another,—Trinitarian or Unitarian, Calvinist or Arminian, Protestant or Roman Catholic. We must, if we are not greatly prejudiced, admit that there are conscientious and earnest men connected with every Church and with no Church. If results so diverse and opposite flow from Free Inquiry,

* See Letter of the Rev. S. C. Nelson to the *Boston Christian Register*.

† See this passage as quoted by the Rev. Dr. Montgomery in a speech published in the *Belfast News-Letter* of December 30, 1862.

how can it be a bond of union? Two brothers, born in the beginning of the present century, the children of a London banker, were educated at the same school, and subjected very much to the same training, physical and mental. Their father died while they were yet young, but their widowed mother watched over them with the utmost solicitude. They both went in due time to the University of Oxford, pursued their studies with the greatest diligence, and rose to eminence. The elder became a fellow of Oriel College, the younger of Baliol College in the same University. Diligent students and earnest thinkers they both were, and as far as we know honest free-inquirers; yet how different the results of their inquiry! The elder is John Henry Newman, who was first a Puseyite, was afterwards admitted into the Church of Rome, and is now one of her most faithful and devoted sons. The younger is Francis H. Newman, who, starting from the same point, proceeded in the opposite direction, became identified with the sceptical school, and is the author of "Phases of Faith." This remarkable case is no argument against Free Inquiry, but it shows to demonstration the absurdity of making Free Inquiry a bond of Church union.

Holyoake, the famous secularist leader, lays Free Inquiry down as a fundamental principle of their body: in its exercise he and others have organized a system which discards Revelation, the Future Life, God—everything beyond the present and the palpable; and if Free Inquiry be a bond of union, then at once all secularists, including many avowed atheists, become members of the Non-Subscribing Church and admissible to its pulpits! But more absurd still,—for there is no limiting the conclusion to which Free Inquiry leads,—we can suppose—and the supposition is not a mere flight of fancy—that some of our foremost thinkers and men of progress may consider that *Polygamy* is right, and therefore we must admit the Polygamist into the Church, the Eldership, and the Pulpit!

We should jealously guard the principle of Free Inquiry: it is the birthright, the gift from God, of every man, and we should cheerfully allow to all its fullest exercise. But while we gratefully recognize it, we should

not on that account be indifferent to those views of religion which we prize as the truth. Men who value the Scriptures as containing a divine revelation, cannot co-operate for the diffusion of Christian knowledge with those who regard them as of no more authority than the precepts of the Greek sages; men who regard Christ as "the power of God and the wisdom of God" cannot unite in missionary efforts with those who consider him to be *a mere man*. To maintain those views of religion which we believe to be true and precious, and to unite with others for their extension, is neither bigotry nor intolerance; but to condemn and injure those who differ from us, no matter how widely, is a great wrong. Men have the same right to be Deists that others have to be believers in a divine revelation; but those who believe in revelation, and make it the basis of their Church, cannot be expected to co-operate for the spread of religion with those who reject it; and therefore the necessity of distinctly defining our principles. Neither party is the enemy of Free Inquiry, but when the results of that inquiry are so different, there can be no true religious union—there can only be peace in entire separation.

CONGREGATIONAL MEMOIRS.

BALLYCARRY (OR BROADISLAND) CONGREGATION.

(Continued from p. 130.)

IV.—JOHN BANKHEAD, 1763 to 1833. The method of Mr. Bankhead's introduction to the Ballycarry Congregation, with which he was connected for seventy years,* may be traced in the following extracts from the Presbytery book, which are arranged continuously:—

"ANTRIM, June 29, 1762.—The Commissioners from Broadisland requested that Mr. Bankhead, a probationer belonging to the Pres-

* Mr. Brice was settled in Ballycarry in 1613, and died in 1636. Mr. Cunningham was ordained there in 1645, and died in 1697, having been pastor fifty-two years. Mr. Cobham was ordained in 1700, and died in 1759, having been minister fifty-nine years. Mr. Bankhead was ordained in 1763, and died in 1833, after a ministry of seventy years. Thus three ministers served this Congregation for a period of 181 years; and four, with a vacancy of nine years, for 220 years, being an average ministry to each of fifty-five years. These days and ministries are gone!

bytery of Ballymena, may be procured to supply that Congregation the month of August next. This was granted, and Mr. Fullerton was appointed to wait on the Presbytery of Ballymena and solicit this request.

"LAIRNE, *August 17, 1762.*—Broadisland: thence appeared Commissioners, John Clark and John Silliman, supplicating that Mr. Bankhead be continued to supply that Congregation the month of September; and that Mr. Caldwell, from the Presbytery of Letterkenny, may be procured to supply them the month of October next; and in case he (Mr. Caldwell) cannot be obtained, that Mr. Bankhead be continued the month of October also. The Presbytery, having reasoned a considerable time, put the question, 'Write to the Presbytery of Ballymena for Mr. Bankhead, or not?' The roll was called, and it carried in the affirmative. It was unanimously agreed, that Mr. Caldwell should be wrote for, and in case he cannot be obtained, they are to be supplied in the ordinary way, and not by Mr. Bankhead. Mr. Montgomery is appointed to write to the Presbytery of Ballymena for Mr. Bankhead, and Mr. Rogers to Letterkenny for Mr. Caldwell.

"BALLYNURE, *Dec. 21, 1762.*—The Commissioners from Broadisland requested that Mr. Bankhead might be appointed their constant supplier until next meeting, in order that he may receive a call from them and become their minister. The Presbytery resolved, that Mr. Montgomery shall write to the Presbytery of Ballymena, requesting them to send Mr. Bankhead to supply Broadisland the four last Sabbaths in January and first in February next, and that they be supplied the rest of the time by ordained ministers.

"CARRICKFERGUS, *Feb. 8, 1763.*—Broadisland: thence appeared Samuel M'Dowell and James Steel, Commissioners, supplicating that a minister be appointed to preach to that Congregation next Sabbath, and see a call subscribed to Mr. Bankhead; and also that a member be appointed to attend the Presbytery of Ballymena, with Commissioners from them, to solicit that Presbytery to recommend said call to Mr. Bankhead, and give him his credentials, that he may be put on trials by this Presbytery for ordination. Messrs. Dunbar, Rodgers, and Montgomery, informed the Presbytery that, at the request of Mr. Edmunstone, they met at Ballycarry Tuesday last past, and inquired into the unanimity of the people of Broadisland with respect to their calling Mr. Bankhead, and that they appeared perfectly unanimous. The Commissioners likewise informed the Presbytery that they would pay Mr. Bankhead annually £15, and allow him the benefit of the minister's farm. The Presbytery, well pleased with the answer from Broadisland, unanimously agreed to grant their supplication, and accordingly have appointed Mr. Thomson to preach at Ballycarry next Sabbath, and lay a call before that people, to be by them subscribed for Mr. Bankhead; and Mr. Rogers is appointed to write to the Presbytery of Ballymena, and request them to send Mr. Bankhead with credentials to this Presbytery, some members of which are to meet as soon as they are informed by the Moderator that Mr. Bankhead can attend, and recommend to him said call, and give

him a piece of trials for ordination, and appoint him constant supplier to Broadisland.

“BALLYMENA, *April 26, 1763.*—The Moderator informed the Presbytery that he had received an answer from the Rev. Presbytery of Ballymena to Mr. Rogers his letter, and called some members of the Presbytery who met at Ballynure the 25th February, saw Mr. Bankhead's credentials, recommended the call from Broadisland to his serious consideration, appointed him to deliver at this meeting a Presbyterial exercise from Heb. xiii. 11, and to supply the Congregation of Broadisland as formerly requested. Mr. Bankhead delivered a Presbyterial exercise from Heb. xiii. 11, which was approved, and appointed at next meeting to deliver a common head upon that question, viz., ‘How is the Divine Providence exercised over the intellectual and brutal creation?’ Broadisland: thence appeared Robert Symmenton and John Clark, Commissioners, supplicating that the Lord's Supper be administered to that Congregation about the usual times, and that the ordination of Mr. Bankhead be fixed on the Tuesday after it.

“Resolved, ‘That the Lord's Supper be administered to the Congregation of Broadisland as soon as may be convenient, and that the time be fixed on for that purpose at next meeting; but as to the ordination of Mr. Bankhead nothing can be fixed on until he has performed the usual trials.’

“LURGAN, *June 28, 1763.*—Mr. Bankhead delivered a common head from the question ‘How is the Providence of God exercised over the intelligent and brutal creation?’ which was considered and approved, and at next meeting he is to deliver a popular Sermon from Hab. ii. 4. He is to deliver a Latin exegesis, defend his thesis, and be examined at next meeting. Broadisland: thence appeared James Silliman, Commissioner, supplicating that Mr. Bankhead's trials be forwarded with all convenient speed, and that he be ordained before harvest, provided the Presbytery approve his trials, and he accept the call from Broadisland. This granted as far as can be now.

“BALLYEASTON, *July 26, 1763.*—Broadisland: thence appeared Commissioners Robert Symmenton and John Clark, supplicating that Mr. Bankhead may be ordained before harvest, provided he accepts their call. The Presbytery proceeded to take the rest of Mr. Bankhead's trial, and accordingly examined him in the languages, philosophy, and theology. He delivered a Latin exegesis, defended his thesis, and subscribed the following formula, to wit, ‘I believe the Westminster Confession to contain a system of the Christian doctrines, which doctrines I subscribe as the confession of my faith.—J. BANKHEAD.’* He also subscribed 40s. annu-

* After this very loose form of subscription to the Westminster Confession, we are quite prepared for the following entry in the Presbytery's Books:—“BALLYNURE, *Feb. 3, 1765.*—Some members proposed that before Mr. Dunbar should be licensed he should be called upon to subscribe the Westminster Confession of Faith in the usual formula. To this it was objected, that requiring subscription to any human compo-*sure* (sic) or insisting on any other confession of faith than that the sacred Scriptures are the only rule of faith and practice, was inconsis-

ally to the Widows' Fund. The whole trials were considered and approved. The Commissioners were asked what security they would give for Mr. Bankhead's stipend, which they formerly and now informed the Presbytery would be £45 yearly, and the benefit of the minister's farm, provided he became their minister. They answered that a bond would be given by every person in the parish for the stipend he promised to pay. The Presbytery told the Commissioners they did not look upon such securities to be agreeable, and urged that a general bond should be perfected by some of the heads of the Congregation, and that the bonds of the individuals should be given to them. The Commissioners replied that their constituents, they believed, would not agree to that proposal, for that the security offered was the only one they were willing to give. Mr. Bankhead, having heard what was said by the Commissioners, was desired to give an answer to the call from Broadisland. He declared his willingness to accept the call, provided the Presbytery, to whom he acknowledged great obligations, were satisfied. The Presbytery were satisfied with this declaration, and accordingly appointed the meeting for ordination on the 3rd Tuesday in August next, being the 16th day of the month; Mr. Read (Glenarm) to preach and preside in the ordination, Mr. White (Templepatrick) to give the charge. The Presbytery, in the meantime, expect and request that the people of Broadisland may either give a general bond for Mr. Bankhead's stipend, or at least a bond for every seat; and to give them an opportunity of doing this, have ordered Mr. Dunbar (Islandmagee) to preach to that people Sabbath come se'nnight, serve the edict, and see the securities perfected for Mr. Bankhead's stipend, Messrs. Rogers (Ballynure) and Fullerton (Carrickfergus) to meet with him on the Monday after he preaches in Ballearry for that purpose, and a copy of this Minute is to be read in the meeting-house of Broadisland next Sabbath.

Here, unfortunately, a leaf has been lost out of the old Minute Book of the Templepatrick Presbytery, so that we have no account of the method of Mr. Bankhead's ordination, nor of the way in which the difference between the Presbytery and the Congregation as to the matter of the bond for stipend was settled. At first, matters do not seem to have been very encouraging to

tent with Christian liberty, and therefore ought not to be insisted on. After some reasoning the question was put, "Require subscription to the Westminster Confession or not;" the roll was called and it carried 'not.' The Moderator (John M'Connell, Killead) then licensed Mr. Dunbar to preach the Christian Religion, and enjoined him to do it according to his own judgment, and not to be influenced by the authority of men." The members present on this occasion were,—*Ministers*, John M'Connell (Killead), W. Rodgers (Ballynure), John Wright (Donegore), Robert White (Templepatrick), David Fullerton (Carrickfergus), William Montgomery (Ballyeaston), with *Elders*, John Campbell (Killead), George Patterson (Ballynure), James Boyd (Ballyeaston).

Mr. Bankhead in Ballycarry, as will appear from the following Minute of Broadisland Session, being the only sessional record I have been able to recover :—

“*Nov. 30, 1763.*—The Minister and Session of Broadisland met for prayer, when it was resolved that they henceforth meet for the same purpose the last Wednesday of every month, and none being present at the hour appointed but Mr. Bankhead and Robert Simon-ton, they in their turn presided in prayer, and resolved that next meeting for prayer be the last Wednesday of Dec. next.”

At a meeting of Presbytery, held April 24, 1764, “Mr. Bankhead returned the following persons to be Elders in the Congregation of Broadisland, to wit, James Locke, John Horsborough, John Blair, John Clark, James Silliman, John Huey, William Carley, and Hu. Campbell.”*

“*BALLYCARRY, July 26, 1769.*—Visitation Presbytery : appeared from Session, Messrs. Robert Symmenton and Robert Iealls(*sic*); and from the Congregation, Messrs. Archibald Beggs, and William Blair, Commissioners. Mr. Bankhead being removed, the Commissioners were asked if he discharged the duties of his office as Gospel Minister among them to the satisfaction and edification of his people. They answered they were well pleased with his ministry and behaviour. The Commissioners were asked how the Session behaved in their office; they answered they had no exception to their character or conduct. Mr. Bankhead was asked how the people of his congregation attended upon his ministry. He said they were very regular in their attendance upon public worship, and decent in their behaviour towards him. The Commissioners were asked if accounts between Mr. Bankhead and them had been stated; and they produced a clear discharge till November last. The Presbytery were well satisfied with all the reports from Broadisland Congregation.”

From 1771 to 1795 there are not, I believe, any regular Minutes extant of the Presbytery of Templepatrick, with which the Congregation of Ballycarry was connected. For a part of this period there are rough notes, principally of “visitations” which were held, at different dates, in the several Congregations of which the Presbytery consisted, either by the entire Presbytery or by a Committee appointed for that purpose. At Ballycarry, visitation Presbyteries were held in the following years, 1773, 1776, 1781, 1784, 1790, 1793, 1796, and 1809; but the particulars of these need not be given, as they are gene-

* The names, as given in a leaf of an old torn Session Book of Broadisland, are somewhat different. “*May 5, 1761.*—The names of those added to the Session are as follow :—James Silliman, James Locke, John Horsborough, John Howie, James M‘Gallard, David Morrow.”

rally recorded in the form above quoted under date July 26, 1769. The main object of these visitations seems to have been to inquire into the state of the stipend account between the Minister and his people; on which point it should be recorded to the credit of Ballycarry Congregation that it makes a very respectable appearance as compared with other Congregations, whose arrears in some cases are stated to amount to several hundreds of pounds. In Ballycarry the deficiency never reached any considerable sum, except in the year 1809, when I cannot exactly make out whether it amounted to £70 or £170. I may also mention that, at the visitation of 1809, "Mr. Bankhead expressed himself perfectly satisfied with the conduct of the Congregation, and said they did not leave the house till publick worship was finished." This latter point was one into which the Presbytery had felt themselves constrained particularly to inquire at all their visitations, in consequence of a practice which had crept into their Congregations, and perhaps has not entirely left them, "of quitting the meeting-house before public worship is over." In 1773 the Presbytery had denounced this custom as "indecent and irreligious, and very reproachful to Presbyterians;" and they expressed "a hope that all who desired the interests of religion would be influenced by the Presbytery's advice in this matter, as the fault complained of was a great reproach to Dissenters."

In 1774 occurred a case with respect to Ballycarry Congregation and its Minister, the record of which it may be allowable to quote, as illustrating a point of old Presbyterian discipline.

"DOWNGORE, *August 2, 1774*.—Mr. Birch represented, in a letter to us, that in conformity to the order of last General Synod, he, as a member of the Presbytery of Dromore, and by appointment of that Presbytery, attended at Comber (Co. Down) last Monday, saw a unanimous call subscribed by that people to Mr. Bankhead, and in the name of that Presbytery, requested that said call be recommended to Mr. Bankhead's serious consideration, and that he be appointed to attend the meeting of their Presbytery with credentials the last Tuesday of this instant, in order that he may become constant supplier of Comber Congregation. A supplication was also presented from the Congregation of Comber by Messrs. John Montgomery, William Stitt, and Robert Montgomery, entreating that their unanimous call to Mr. Bankhead (which they produced) might be recommended to his serious consideration. The call was

read, subscribed by a great number, upwards of 150, and attested by Mr. Birch. In their call they mention for Mr. Bankhead's encouragement that £74 will be his annual stipend, and the Commissioners added that the wealthier people in the Congregation intended to add something to the price of their seats, which would augment the stipend promised to Mr. Bankhead. The reasons for Mr. Bankhead's removal from Broadisland were produced and read, viz.:—1. The Congregation of Comber has for a considerable time been distracted by party and faction; and till they had the good fortune and happiness of hearing Mr. Bankhead there was not the least probability of their uniting. Since they had the hearing of him they are perfectly united in friendship and harmony. 2. Should they be so unfortunate as not to obtain Mr. Bankhead for their minister, past experience convinces them that they would be unavoidably thrown back into their former confusion and unhappy division, which would hurt the interest of religion and also that of the Protestant Dissenters. 3. And therefore, to consult for the interest of both, they apprehend that it is absolutely necessary to remove a minister from a smaller to a much larger congregation, which requires a man of Mr. Bankhead's abilities to undertake the pastoral charge of them; and it is universally allowed that a less good should be dispensed with to obtain a greater. 4. And last, they are determined to contribute more largely towards the maintenance and support of that gentleman and his family than the Congregation does where he at present resides; which premises duly considered, will, we hope, induce the good people of Broadisland cheerfully to part with Mr. Bankhead. This supplication was considered, and after some reasoning it was unanimously agreed that a copy of these reasons should be sent to the Congregation of Broadisland before the call should be recommended, and therefore that the recommending of the call from Comber should be postponed until this day se'nnight, at the installation of Mr. Abernethy at Templepatrick. Resolved, also, that what Mr. Birch requests concerning Mr. Bankhead's supplying Comber after the last Tuesday of this month cannot now be granted; but in the meantime, as Mr. Bankhead declared that it was his resolution not to keep the good people of Comber under any unnecessary suspense, he will write a letter to the Presbytery of Dromore, and inform them when they may instruct the people of Comber to send Commissioners to attend a meeting of the Presbytery of Templepatrick and receive his answer to their call.

“CARRICKFERGUS, *Sept. 8, 1774.*—Mr. Rodgers (the Clerk) informed the Presbytery that, at the desire of Mr. Bankhead, he had called them to meet on this day. Conduct approved. From Comber appeared Commissioners Messrs. John Riddle, John Andrews, &c., &c., supplicating that the Rev. Mr. Bankhead's answer to their unanimous call, now in hands, and which he hath had under his consideration, may be obtained. From Broadisland appeared Commissioners Messrs. Alex. Gillespy, Thomas Horsborough, &c., &c., who produced a supplication wherein they request that the Presbytery of Templepatrick may not consent to the removal of Mr. Bankhead from their Congregation to that of Comber, seeing that

his removal, should it take place, would be productive of consequences most disagreeable to them; and as a mark of their attachment to him, that his annual stipend shall be £47* from November last; and further, that they will raise a considerable sum of money, which they intend to offer him as a present, provided he continues to be their minister. The parties being heard, Mr. Bankhead was called, who, after expressing a high and grateful sense of the regard the people of Comber had discovered to him, returned their call, and declared that his attachment to his own Congregation of Broadisland was such that he could not indulge the thought of leaving them, though he declared he had not made up his mind with respect to this yesterday, otherwise he would have sent an express to Comber to prevent them from taking the trouble of coming here this day."

Some of the foregoing considerations addressed to Mr. Bankhead by the rival claimants of his ministry were eminently practical. In fact they were purely pecuniary, and if, in this view of the matter, any one should wonder that a trifling addition of £2 per annum to his stipend should induce Mr. Bankhead to remain at Ballycarry, and to decline the call of a Congregation which implored him to come to them as their angel of peace, and which moreover offered him a stipend of £74, being nearly £30 more than even the increased stipend of Ballycarry, perhaps the matter may be explained by stating that in the call for Comber there was no mention of a minister's farm, whereas in Ballycarry Mr. Bankhead had a fine grazing and tillage farm, which he was enabled to stock under peculiarly favourable circumstances, and out of which, being an excellent judge of cattle, he realized a very considerable fortune. He had also most generous patrons in the Edmonstone family of Red-Hall. While they lived they remembered their minister most handsomely; and even at their death they did not forget him. Archibald Edmonstone, Esq., by codicil to his will dated March 17, 1766, left "to the Rev. Mr. John Bankhead, Dissenting minister of the parish of Broadisland, all his religious and history books, excepting those which had Mrs. Edmonstone's name in writing on them." And Mrs. Edmonstone herself—popularly called "the Lady"—by her will dated January 29, 1777, bequeathed "to Mr. Bankhead, as an expression of her regard for him,

* An increase of only £2 per annum. In their call to Mr. B. they were bound for £45.

Twenty Pounds sterling." But their gifts during life were far greater. Mr. Bankhead expressed his gratitude by calling more than one of his children by the name of Edmonstone,—a name which he had so much reason to respect and revere.

From the year last above quoted (1774) I meet with nothing in the minutes concerning the Ballycarry Congregation, except the visitations already mentioned, until we come to the year 1812, when we have the following entry:—

"At a *pro re nata* meeting of Presbytery at Broadisland, held on Tuesday, March 4, 1812, the Moderator stated that, having received a requisition from a number of the parishioners of the Congregation of Broadisland, which requisition was also signed by Mr. Bankhead himself, begging the Presbytery to take into consideration the state of that Congregation,* he had thought fit to call the present meeting. Mr. Bankhead read a paper expressive of his resolution to concur with the Congregation in the choice of an assistant and successor, of which the following is a copy:—'I purpose to join in an application to Presbytery for a hearing of any young man the Congregation shall nominate, with a view to his becoming my assistant and successor. When he shall be chosen, and appointed constant supplier, my stipend shall cease, as upon him the labouring oar of ministerial duty must rest. At the November next following the time of his ordination, he shall have possession of the minister's farm, and the house may accommodate us both during the winter. When the winter shall be over, I shall no longer encumber him. The Congregation must know that it is the practice of the Presbyterian Church to clear off the stipend before ordination. It is, therefore, unnecessary to say anything of it here. When the above was read to the Congregation, Mr. M'Bride moved that Mr. Bankhead's stipend should end when the invited young man's preaching should begin. To this I agreed, having chiefly at heart the peace and edification of the people.—JOHN BANKHEAD.'

"Mr. Prenter † produced credentials from the Presbytery of Armagh, and was received under the care of the Presbytery of Templepatrick. Commissioners from Broadisland requested the Presbytery to nominate a young man to preach four Lord's days with a view to a call. The Presbytery unanimously appointed Mr. Prenter to preach for that period; and Mr. Thomas Alexander was appointed to take the minds of the people.

"At a *pro re nata* meeting of Presbytery, April, 1812, Mr. Alexander reported that on taking the minds of the people of Broadisland, there was not a synodical majority for Mr. Prenter. Commissioners appeared requesting supplies, which were granted."

* Alluding, I believe, to a recent incident in Mr. Bankhead's domestic life.

† A son-in-law of Mr. Bankhead's.

The unanimous choice of the Congregation soon fell upon Mr. Glendy, who became the fifth Minister of Broadisland.*

(To be continued.)

W A I T .

"Wait on the Lord: be of good courage, and he shall strengthen thine heart: wait, I say, on the Lord."—Ps. xxvii. 14.

"Weeping may endure for a night, but joy cometh in the morning."—Ps. xxx. 5.

Wait! for the day is breaking,
Though the dull night be long;
Wait! God is not forsaking
Thy heart. Be strong—be strong!

Wait! and the clouds of sorrow
Shall melt in gentle showers,
And hues from heaven shall borrow,
As they fall amidst the flowers.

Wait! 'tis the key to pleasure,
And to the plan of God;
Oh, tarry thou his leisure—
Thy soul shall bear no load!

Wait! for the time is hasting
When life shall be made clear,
And all who know heart-wasting
Shall feel that God is near.

* Mr. Bankhead, as already stated, did not die till 1833, but as his name will not again prominently occur, I may here mention that he was interred in the Old Churchyard of Templecorran, where his tombstone bears the following inscription, in which the years of his ministry are inadvertently set down as 72 instead of 70:—"Rev. John Bankhead, a faithful and enlightened Minister of the Gospel, died 5th of July, 1833, in the 97th year of his age, and 72nd of his ministry in Broadisland. In memory of his affection, this stone was placed here by his Wife, Mary." Mr. Bankhead was twice married, and had altogether 22 children; of these 19 arrived at years of maturity, to all of whom, I believe, their prudent father—a country minister—gave or bequeathed a handsome competence. His widow is still living.

WHAT THE SCRIPTURES TEACH.—No. 5.

WE have considered what the doctrine of the Scriptures is respecting the Father and the Son; we come now to inquire what they teach concerning the Holy Ghost or Spirit. In opening the Sacred Volume we find frequent reference to the Holy Spirit, or the Spirit of God, and on examination we ascertain that the term is often employed to denote God himself: thus—"The Spirit of God hath made me."—Job xxiii. 4. "Whither shall I go from thy spirit, or whither shall I flee from thy presence?"—Ps. cxxxix. 7. "My spirit shall not always strive with man."—Gen. vi. 3. "Why hath Satan filled thine heart to lie to the Holy Ghost? . . . thou hast not lied unto men, but unto God."—Acts v. 3, 4. Sometimes the Spirit of God or the Holy Spirit is used to denote the exercise of God's power or wisdom. "If I by the spirit of God cast out devils"—Matt. xii. 28; while in the parallel passage in another Evangelist we read—"If I with the finger of God cast out devils."—Luke xi. 20. "By his spirit he hath garnished the heavens."—Job xxvi. 13. But much more frequently the Holy Spirit denotes the influence of God on the mind and soul of his children. "The spirit of the Lord God shall rest upon him, the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and might, the spirit of knowledge and of the fear of the Lord."—Isaiah xi. 2. "Prophecy came not in old time by the will of man: but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost."—2 Peter i. 21. "They were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and they spake the word of God with boldness."—Acts iv. 31. The Holy Spirit was bestowed without measure on Jesus. "God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost and with power."—Acts x. 38. "God giveth not the spirit by measure unto him."—John iii. 34.

The Scriptures do not teach that the Holy Spirit is a person; for they represent it as being "poured out," "shed forth," "anointed with," "baptized with:" but they sometimes personify it, as they personify death, sin, and other things. Thus it is represented as the Comforter—"And I will pray the Father, and he will give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you for ever, even the

spirit of truth.”—John xiv. 16, 17. “The Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you.”—John xiv. 26. It is true that the Holy Spirit is linked with two persons, the Father and the Son, in the form of baptism (Matt. xxviii. 19): but the important office which the spirit of God exerts in carrying out the scheme of redemption sufficiently explains its introduction in this passage.

The Scriptures distinctly teach that the spirit of God, with its sanctifying and comforting influence, is bestowed on all who earnestly seek it. “If ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children: how much more shall your heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to them that ask him?”—Luke xi. 13. The doctrine of Scripture, therefore, respecting the Holy Spirit seems evidently to be that it is not a distinct person, but God himself, or God’s influence on the human soul—to enlighten, sanctify, and comfort,—and that our heavenly Father will bestow that influence in a greater or less degree on those who seek it.

THE LATE MR. SCOTT OF GIRVAN.

MR. MATTHEW SCOTT was a native of Girvan, in Ayrshire. His parents were strict Calvinists in their religious opinions, and they brought up their son in the same faith. He received his education in the parish school, and when he left it he was considered a good Latin scholar. In early youth he was very fond of mathematics. His father was a hosier by trade, and he was put to the same business. About thirty years ago, when he was working in a small village called Patna, he became acquainted with a Mr. Alexander Galbraith, who was a rather singular, but shrewd and talented man, and a decided Unitarian. This individual had considerable influence in leading Mr. Scott to embrace liberal views of Christianity. About this time he got the loan of a discourse, by the late Dr. Southwood Smith, on “The Incompatibility of the Trinity with that of the Divine

Unity." He often said that this discourse made him a Unitarian. On returning home, he did not conceal the change that was going on in his mind with regard to popular theology. He unfolded his new ideas freely to those who were willing to listen, and in a short time he gathered a few of the working class around him who were disposed to receive more rational views of Bible doctrine than were commonly held. His earliest friend and companion was smitten with the heresy. This person was the teacher of the Charity School of Girvan, and he paid the penalty of expulsion for his honesty in openly avowing Unitarian sentiments. He is still alive, and an honour to the small Congregation to which Mr. Scott ministered. About this time, and in order to crush the rising heresy, the Rev. Mr. Duncán, U. P. Minister, delivered some violent and denunciatory discourses against what he called "Socinianism," and set the town in a perfect storm of fear and horror at the new doctrine. The circumstances becoming known to the late Rev. George Harris, he took a deep interest in the matter, and went through to Girvan, and delivered several discourses on the distinguishing doctrines of Unitarianism, to those who were not easily frightened by clerical anathemas. Now was the time for action, said Mr. Scott; and by his zeal and energy the few friends whom he had gathered around him were formed into a Christian Church. They met at first in a private house, and sometimes in a beaming workshop, and he was always the moving and sustaining spirit among them. About this crisis they applied for the Town Hall for Mr. Harris to preach in, but the Council refused it, though it was let for all kinds of popular amusements. This manifestation of bigotry and intolerance roused Mr. Scott. He appealed to the Unitarians of Great Britain and Ireland to aid them in building a place of worship for themselves, and went to Ireland and preached in behalf of this scheme. The appeal was kindly and promptly responded to, and soon the Society was enabled to go on with its plans. The chapel was built in 1850, and opened in 1851 by the Rev. George Harris. The Orthodox clergy now became alarmed. A meeting of the ministers of the town and neighbourhood was held, and it was agreed that they should fully charge

their "spiritual guns," and make one united attack on the faith of the infant Church, and annihilate it altogether in Girvan. The only minister who opposed the movement was the Rev. Mr. Waddell. Mr. Easton, Minister of the Reformed Presbyterian Church, was appointed to open the campaign, which he did by a violent and fearful onslaught on the young Church. Mr. Scott stood firm in defence of his new faith. He replied to the first attack in a small pamphlet, very ably written, and much to the point. The people of Girvan were astonished; they could not credit him for the talent and knowledge which it manifested, and they ascribed it to Mr. Harris; but they were soon undeceived in this matter. Mr. Scott attended Mr. Easton's Lectures, and promptly replied to each of them as they were delivered. Before the course was finished the Orthodox party became uneasy, and used all their influence to prevent the sale of the letters in reply. It was generally confessed, also, that in these letters Mr. Scott surpassed his ministerial opponent in Scriptural argument and power. Seeing that there was no indication of a favourable issue to their cause, the rest of the clergy backed out of the campaign, and left Mr. Easton and Mr. Scott to fight the battle between themselves. And thus ended the first and last united attempt to extinguish the Unitarian faith in Girvan. Shortly after this, bigotry and intolerance fell asleep, and Mr. Scott, from his known character and abilities, was unanimously chosen Inspector of the Poor. In this public and onerous situation, which he held for several years before his death, he gained the esteem and confidence of all parties, and discharged its duties in a most exemplary manner. He was often consulted by inspectors and lawyers on difficult matters connected with the Poor Laws.

Mr. Scott was also an excellent newspaper reporter. A series of papers on Pauperism in Girvan appeared some time ago in the *Ayrshire Observer*, which shewed that he was a man of no common ability. It may be said that he fell a victim to a deep sense of duty. When visiting the lowest hovels of poverty and disease in the course of his duty, he caught fever, which was prevalent in the town, and was struck down at once, having never rallied. The announcement of his death produced a sen-

sation in the town, and threw over it a cloud of deep sorrow and melancholy. A large and respectable company followed his remains to the grave, and all the clergy, with one exception, did themselves and him an honour by their presence. The Rev. Mr. Crosskey, of Glasgow, officiated on the occasion.

Mr. Scott was a man of an amiable disposition, modest and retiring in his general habits, and full of zeal in all matters pertaining to the well-being of man, and the cause of what he considered true religion. His religious feelings were of a high order, and very sensitive. It pained him much to hear of any Unitarian identifying the theology of Theodore Parker with that of Christian Unitarianism. He has left a widow and one child. His death will be a great loss to the little congregation he presided over with zeal and love. If nothing can be done for it, the members will very likely be scattered to the winds, and their neat, beautiful chapel become the abode of dampness and mildew, and a by-word among the people.

On Sunday, March 29, Mr. Crosskey preached in the Unitarian Church, Girvan, in the morning and evening, to large audiences, many who were not members of the Congregation having attended from respect to the memory of Mr. Scott, and sympathy with the sorrowing flock. The discourses were impressive and instructive, and well calculated to improve the sad occasion.

The following obituary notice we extract from the *Ayr Advertiser*, to whose columns Mr. Scott was an occasional contributor:—

“Our obituary last week contained a simple announcement of the death of Mr. Matthew Scott, Inspector of Poor, which took place on Wednesday, the 18th inst. We cannot refrain from recurring to the event, so far as to say that Mr. Scott was not an ordinary man. He possessed powers of mind of a high order, and a large fund of knowledge; and was withal a man of great earnestness and honesty of purpose. The modesty of his nature kept him from intruding himself on the public notice; but when occasion required, he proved himself no mean champion of the views he held, whether in religion, politics, or social economy. . . . His death was caused by a malignant fever, which he caught while discharging his duties amongst the poor.”

CARRICKFERGUS CONGREGATION.

"AN ARTFUL DODGE."

IN the year 1827, the General Synod of Ulster enforced "a human test of faith" upon its ministers. That act, after three years' energetic discussion, resulted in the secession of seventeen congregations, which formed themselves, in the year 1830, into the Remonstrant Synod of Ulster, adopting the Code of Discipline of the older Synod as the law of the new Association.

In several places respectable minorities of Congregations organized new worshipping Societies in connexion with the Remonstrants; and, after many years' zealous exertions, the late eloquent Wm. Glendy, of Ballycarry, aided by a singularly intelligent layman (the late excellent Samuel Nelson), established a promising Congregation in Carrickfergus. A suitable meeting-house, which cost about £1700, was opened in the year 1834, and the society continued to be united and reasonably prosperous, in connexion with the Remonstrant Synod, until last year, when the resignation of their minister, J. N. Porter, led to serious divisions, and developed unsuspected plans amongst a bustling and presumptuous minority, the leaders of whom are well known to be deeply imbued with "*The New Theology*." These men were almost exclusively "new settlers," who had not contributed one farthing to the creation of the valuable Congregational property; but, living in the town, assuming great zeal, and being very intrusive, they contrived to secure a majority on the Committee, and the consequent possession of the Meeting-house keys and Congregational books.

At the head of this small party, (who, by various arts and misrepresentations, induced some eight or ten worthy *Christian* men and women to join them,) was Mr. James Andrews, "Attorney-at-Law," whose honoured name and connexions restrain my pen. The entire *united* party, however, I have been credibly informed and sincerely believe, did not, by themselves or their ancestors, contribute £10 to the creation of the valuable Congregational property, worth £1700! That property, however, with equal *decency and honesty*, they determined to seize, and to appropriate to purposes directly the opposite of those for which it had been created. The dexterously-obtained possession of the keys and books afforded them facilities for carrying out these designs. They appointed partisan collectors, who received or refused Stipend as it suited their purpose; they secretly crowded the stipend-list with "fagot-voters,"—four, five, or six of whom were, in several instances, members of the same family; and, when they had their masked batteries thus prepared, they suddenly opened a vigorous fire upon the old and Christian members, who constituted at least two-thirds of the *bona fide* voters of the Congregation.

This assault was made in the form of a vote, which, (based upon a lying Resolution,) pretended to remove the Congregation from the Remonstrant Synod, and to place it under the Presbytery of Antrim. This vote, by the aid of their *sham members*, and in open violation of decency and the laws of their Church, they riotously

declared to be carried, in defiance of all lawful protests and opposition by the actual majority of the real seatholders. The Presbytery of Antrim, though regularly informed of the foul means employed, received the *minority* as the Congregation—sent ministers to occupy the pulpit by means of the keys, which had been secured by the arts already stated—and kept the possession thus shamefully obtained by the personal assistance of Mr. James Andrews and his instruments, who held the pulpit stairs, and threatened with actual violence the Remonstrant minister who proceeded to officiate, if he should attempt to enter the pulpit in discharge of his lawful duty!

The majority, thus maltreated and insulted by a small and unscrupulous faction, were quite able, and very much disposed, to resume the possession of their property by forcibly ejecting their opponents, both lay and clerical; but the Remonstrant minister who was present prevailed upon them “to bear patiently the spoiling of their goods,” rather than incur the certainty of riot and the probability of bloodshed. Acting upon the same principle of forbearance, the Remonstrants, on several Sundays and other occasions, subsequently asserted and claimed their just rights, in conformity with eminent legal advice, in order to lay the foundation of an appeal to the Court of Chancery; and then unanimously elected a zealous and popular young minister (the Rev. Robert Cleland), who was regularly ordained on the 29th of December last, and who has since most acceptably conducted public worship in the Old County Court-House.

Mr. Cleland's call was signed by 63 stipend-payers—including *three* of the four Trustees to whom the grant of the Congregational property was made by Lord Donegall—and likewise by the daughter and grand-daughter of good Samuel Nelson, to whose intelligent zeal and large pecuniary contributions, the Congregation was mainly indebted for its establishment.

A memorable circumstance, as discreditable to one party as it was honourable to another, occurred at Mr. Cleland's ordination. Whilst the young minister and his Christian Congregation were excluded from their own meeting-house by the Andrews faction, the *Rev. Mr. Warwick*, a Calvinistic minister, with a tolerant and liberal spirit which can never be forgotten, generously opened his convenient Church for the Ordination Services.

From that time, the Remonstrants have, under eminent advice, steadily determined to assert their just rights in a Court of Equity; and, although prudential considerations have produced some delay in entering the Suit, they have never, for one moment, wavered in their resolution. Knowing, indeed, “the glorious uncertainty of the law,” they do not swagger and boast like their opponents, of whose pettifogging tactics and capabilities they are well aware—but, at the same time, they will not tamely submit to see a valuable property wrested from its rightful owners, and applied to purposes the very opposite of those for which it was created, by a few individuals that have no social, moral, or religious claim to its possession.

The preceding statements were necessary to the due understanding of “an artful dodge” which has just been attempted, to deter

the Remonstrants of Carrickfergus from the vindication of their lawful rights. In *The Non-Subscriber* for the present month, Mr. James Andrews, or his substitute, has ostentatiously published seven "*Queries*" submitted to counsel, in the Carrickfergus case, and the inevitable "*Answers*" to said Questions. The legal eminence of *Mr. Lawson*, no man will dispute; and I rejoice to know that my young friend, *Mr. William Drennan Andrews*, is likely to sustain the high reputation of the two honourable hereditary names which he bears. Their *Answers*, therefore, are probably quite correct, according to "*the Case*" submitted to their consideration. But, if that case, from beginning to end, was altogether a concocted or "*cooked*" *fiction*, "*the Queries*" founded upon it were entirely delusive and fraudulent, and "*the Answers*" to them are not worth the paper on which they were written. As the case has not been printed, its suppression affords strong presumptive evidence that it was *manufactured* for a purpose; and, I am convinced that it is substantially the same which Mr. James Andrews laid before the Presbytery of Antrim on the 14th of November last, to supply them with a pretext for arriving at "*a foregone conclusion.*" That statement I subsequently demonstrated, by facts and documents, to have been either an *entire fiction*, or a wilful suppression of the truth, from beginning to end; and this I shall have an opportunity of *proving*, should the wrong-doers be rash enough to defend their case before a just tribunal. In this view I am confirmed by the contents of "*the Queries*" themselves—for, there is not even *one* of the *entire seven* which could be fairly based upon an *honest statement of facts*. The whole affair, I firmly believe, is a *delusion*, and was designed to be a *snare* for the worthy Counselors, in order to make them unwittingly, prominent players in a paltry game "*of brag and intimidation.*"

The assertion of Mr. James Andrews, that a one-sided opinion, obtained by such arts, "*legally confirms his position as true and right,*" is intensely ludicrous. Upon such principles every *robber*, on stating his own case, could retain his plunder; but Courts of Equity hear *both* sides, and do not rely upon partisan declarations without proof. In my estimation, the unprecedented course of *publishing* the opinion of Counsel, with a mighty flourish of trumpets, is simply an indication of conscious weakness. At the same time, I perfectly understand the objects of the publication, viz. :—

1st. To encourage the *minority* in Carrickfergus, and to obtain subscriptions for their support :

2nd. To dispirit the *majority*, and to prevent them from receiving aid in their difficulties :

3rd. To deter the Remonstrants from asserting a just right, so that property worth £1700 may be permitted to vest quietly in those that never contributed £10 to its creation !

The *first* of these objects *may* be attained, for men are easily deluded ; but the last *two*, I prophesy, will signally fail. So far from creating despondency or inaction, this transparent and disingenuous attempt at intimidation will only awaken a sterner resolution to defend the right ! As to Dr. Montgomery, who, according to Mr.

James Andrews, has so awfully "disgraced himself" by vindicating Christian principles, in opposition to those liberal schemes which would place unbelievers in Christian pulpits, he is an incorrigible old sinner, not likely, as Mr. James Andrews kindly suggests, "even at the eleventh hour," to desert an honest cause, or to acquiesce in what he *knows* would be a public robbery, even if sanctioned by Law.

May 23, 1863.

H. MONTGOMERY.

DR. MONTGOMERY AND THE REV. F. BLAKELY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CHRISTIAN UNITARIAN.

DEAR SIR,—I have great pleasure in acting on the suggestion contained in the last number of *The Christian Unitarian*, and stating simply what occurred between my long-esteemed friend Mr. Blakely and myself respecting my visit to Dr. Montgomery. My important mission to the Doctor was a *pounds, shillings, and pence* affair. Mr. Blakely desired me to request him to pay his *Regium Donum* to me, instead of sending it to his son-in-law's residence in England. I then said to Mr. Blakely—"Should Dr. Montgomery consent to my signing your receipts and getting your money, what steps do you wish me to take with regard to it?" He said—"Never mind, David; I will tell you on your return from Dunmurry." So ended the subject. I had then a good deal of conversation with him on other matters; and when I was about leaving, he said—"Tell the Doctor that, if he can find time to visit me before I leave Ireland, I will be glad to see him." The request respecting the *Regium Donum* the Doctor said he was sorry he could not comply with, as he was bound to send the signature of Mr. Blakely himself to the Government. When I afterwards told him that Mr. Blakely said he would be glad to see him before he left, he said it was not only his place to forgive Mr. Blakely seven times, but seventy times seven; and at the same time he gave me a conditional promise that he would see him before leaving. On my return to Spamount, for the double purpose of delivering my message and bidding farewell to my old friend, I was taken to task by Mrs. Cochrane, who wished to know what the private business was between her father and myself. I mentioned to her the special object of my mission to Dunmurry, but out of delicacy to her I did not dwell on it, for the simple reason that I feared Mrs. Cochrane would reproach her aged father with want of confidence in her and her husband. I said to Mrs. Cochrane—"Perhaps Dr. Montgomery may be here to-day or to-morrow." Her reply was—"I hope to goodness he will not come"—although the Doctor's not coming has been made a handle of by his enemies.

With regard to Mr. Cochrane calling me "an cavesdropper at Spamount and a talebearer at Dunmurry," I emphatically deny the accusations. . . .—I am, dear Sir, yours truly,

EDEN COTTAGE, May 20, 1863.

DAVID ORR.

[We have taken the liberty of omitting the latter part of Mr. Orr's letter, in which he certainly bears hard on Mr. Cochrane, and defends himself from charges which that gentleman had made against him. The portion of the letter which we have given places the matter in dispute in its true light, and the publication of any reply of Mr. Orr to personal attacks on himself, though he might demand it as a matter of justice, is not necessary for the vindication of his character, and might only lead to further correspondence. We trust we shall not be required to publish anything more in this unprofitable controversy.—ED. CH. UN.]

INTELLIGENCE.

UNITARIAN SOCIETY FOR THE DIFFUSION OF CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE.

ON Sunday, May 3, the Annual Sermons on behalf of this Society were preached by the Rev. Francis Bishop, of Chesterfield,—the morning sermon in the First Meeting-house, and the afternoon sermon in the Second Meeting-house, Rosemary Street. After each sermon a collection was taken up in aid of the funds of the Society.

ANNUAL MEETING.

The Annual Meeting of the members and friends of the Society was held on Monday evening, May 4th, in the First Meeting-house—Michael Andrews, Esq., in the chair. The proceedings having been commenced with devotional exercises conducted by the Rev. J. S. Porter, the chairman, after thanking the meeting for the honour conferred on him in placing him in the chair, and expressing his interest in the objects of the Society, called upon the Rev. C. J. M'Alister, the Secretary of the Society, to read the Report for the past year, which was of a highly satisfactory character.

The Rev. J. A. CROZIER, moved the adoption of the report and statement of accounts. He said there was much subject of congratulation on account of the proceedings of the Society during the past year.

Mr. T. B. JOHNSON seconded the motion, and remarked that he thought a larger amount of money should be subscribed so as to afford the Society additional facilities for carrying on its operations.

Mr. W. SPACKMAN moved a vote of thanks to the Rev. F. Bishop for his kindness in accepting their invitation to attend the annual meeting, and for the able and truly Christian discourses which he had preached on behalf of the Society. Mr. WILLIAM CAMPBELL seconded the motion, and the Rev. J. S. PORTER supported it, speaking in flattering terms of Mr. Bishop's services on the previous day.

The Rev FRANCIS BISHOP, in acknowledging the vote, said it gave him great pleasure to revisit Ireland. He had mingled much with the Irish people, especially the poor, both in England and in

their own country; and though he knew the faults of the Irish poor, he also knew their many good and winning qualities of head and heart, and he could truly say of that country as of his own native land—"Ireland, with all thy faults I love thee still." He landed in Belfast at a very early hour in the morning—too early to proceed to his destination,—and for more than two hours he had enjoyed an opportunity of making observations on the outward aspect of the town as compared with its appearance when he had been there before. The improvement was very manifest. The new and handsome buildings that had sprung up, the public institutions that had been founded, the water-fountains that had been erected in such numbers, and the many indications of brisk and active trade that were visible, all went to show a condition of moral and material prosperity that was very gratifying. He wished that the same prosperity were apparent in every part of Ireland; but facts recently dwelt upon in the House of Commons by the Chancellor of the Exchequer shewed that such was not the case. The objects of the Society whose anniversary they were that evening holding, were such as to commend it to their judgment and affection as worthy of warm and zealous support. He had that day been looking through their Depository, and had been struck with the varied and valuable collection of works it contained by their most eminent theological and devotional writers in America and in this country, and which it offered to the public on easy and advantageous terms. Those persons wrong the Unitarian faith who say that it is only fit for the comfortable and well-to-do,—that it may brighten and beautify the placid and tranquil calms of life, but that it is powerless in its storms and tempests. He had seen it tried and put to the test, amid the deepest and most agonizing experiences of human existence, and had never found it unequal to the emergency. A young Episcopal clergyman, whom he had frequently met in his walks in the streets and courts of Liverpool, once asked him how he could work with his Unitarianism in such a mission. "I can understand, Mr. Bishop, how you can do the people much good by inducing them to be temperate and provident, and to look after the education of their children; but I don't know how, with your views, you can minister to them as a religious friend and adviser. Now," continued he, "what would you do when called in to visit a dying person, trembling and agonized at the thought of his sins?" "Well," said I, "I admit that that is a very trying position for any of us to be placed in, to stand by such a bed; but what do *you* in such a case? You don't talk of the Doctrine of the Trinity—you don't read or recite the Athanasian Creed!" "No, no," he replied; "I point to the dying love of Jesus, and set him forth as an all-sufficient Saviour." "Exactly so," said I, "and *I* point, with no less confidence, to the infinite love of the Heavenly Father, as imaged and evidenced in the life and death of Jesus." That clergyman had afterwards told him that his views in regard to Unitarianism had been much modified by what he heard of the results of the Unitarian Mission in Liverpool, and that he saw that it might be accompanied by far more of the power of the Gospel than he at one time thought possible. He (Mr.

Bishop) said that, in dealing with any class of cases amid any scenes, whether in the prison cell or in the abode of the outcast, whether in meeting the hardened and depraved, or ministering to the remorseful and conscience-stricken penitent, he had never once been tempted to wish that he could avail himself of any of the popular orthodox doctrines. He had always found the simple doctrines of Unitarianism adequate to every emergency in his ministry among the poor, the sorrowing, and the sinful, and capable of supplying the influence that was needed. One morning a young woman, overwhelmed with grief, came to him at the Mission-House, Liverpool, and begged him to come and see her dying sister in C—— Street. Though he did not know the young woman, he at once inferred, from the character of the street, to what wretched class these sisters belonged. He found the dying girl suffering from inflammation of the lungs, and her hours were evidently numbered. She knew her danger, and the guilty past came up before her awakened and remorseful mind in all its darkness. The agony of her soul kept flashing out in those wild eyes and in that despairing face, and with difficulty she gasped out as I approached her bedside, "Oh, I'm lost, I'm lost—I cannot meet my God!" Five young women of the same unhappy class as herself surrounded her bed watching her, and, to some extent, sharing in her fears. They were about to withdraw as he went into the room, but he told them not to do so unless they wished it themselves, and all except one remained. He took a Bible from his pocket and quoted, rather than read, some verses from the 103rd Psalm, and the first part of the parable of the Prodigal Son. The awful fears of the terror-stricken penitent were somewhat assuaged by these divine and holy utterances, and he offered to pray—an offer which was eagerly and thankfully accepted by the dying girl. It was a most trying and impressive scene, but falling back upon the truths of the Gospel he endeavoured, amid the sobs and tears of those around him, to give expression to the feelings of strong remorse, and deep longing for pardon, peace, and reconciliation, that were predominant in that chamber of death. Before the day was over the poor awakened sinner had passed on to him whose merciful forgiveness she had so ardently sought. In this, and many other cases of very various character, but all distressing and requiring prompt and efficacious remedies, he had learnt that in the Gospel, as understood by Unitarians, there dwelt an exhaustless power, and a universal applicability. To spread such a religion was a work that might well claim their best energies, and most earnestly did he hope that their Society, which aimed to promote this great work, might go on in an increasingly prosperous and successful career.

The Rev. J. SCOTT PORTER moved the next resolution. He said—I have been entrusted with a resolution expressing our continued attachment to Unitarian principles as the doctrines of the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ, and our earnest desire for their spread among our fellow-men, that they may realize in full measure the happy fruits which these principles are calculated to produce, when sown in a good soil. The principles we advocate, we believe

to be founded on the Holy Scriptures; and in recommending them we acknowledge the claims of human reason and the rights of human brotherhood. We have adopted our opinions upon the ground of free inquiry, and we advocate unlimited, unrestricted free inquiry, for our brethren as well as for ourselves. We wish that every man should be at perfect liberty to canvass every religious doctrine that is presented to his mind, to examine its nature, weigh its evidences, and either accept or reject it, as it may appear to his own judgment to be or not to be conformable to the mind of God. We wish our brethren who may embrace our principles, to do so upon the grounds of the most unrestricted free inquiry. We do not mean merely that they shall be at liberty to embrace our own views. The freedom which we advocate means freedom to agree with those views and freedom to reject them, freedom to maintain them and freedom to discard them. On such grounds we have embraced the Christian faith, and ardently cling to it; and upon no other grounds do we wish the Christian faith to be adopted and professed by our fellow-men. We abhor the thought of using force, or compulsion, or a pressure equivalent to compulsion, or any thing approaching to it, in order to bring men over to the Gospel. Vituperation, social exclusion, and civil penalties on account of religious opinion, we utterly reprobate and condemn. On the same grounds we embrace Christian Unitarianism; and on no other do we wish it to be embraced. We feel that we are not interfering with the rights of our brethren, when, in the spirit of candour and the spirit of love, we ask them to consider the foundations of their own religious opinions, and those of the opinions which are held by Unitarians; to compare both systems together; and if they come to an agreement with us, to avow their allegiance to a common faith. Mr. Porter went on at some length, to recommend the religious views held by Unitarians, as efficacious to guide the doubtful, to strengthen the weak, to confirm the strong, to console the afflicted, and to recover the fallen. He adverted to the fact alluded to in the report, that Her Majesty, in her great affliction, had derived comfort from views not differing in any essential particular from those unfolded in the writings of Unitarian divines; and to the lustre shed upon Unitarian principles by the holy lives and peaceful deaths of many who have embraced them; directing attention especially to the life, character, and labours of Mr. Scott of Girvan, to whose memory he paid a grateful tribute. Mr. Porter concluded by moving the following resolution:—"That, believing Christian Unitarianism to be 'the truth as it is in Jesus,' embodied in the teachings, life, death, and resurrection of our Blessed Lord, and confirmed by his inspired Apostles, we feel it to be our bounden duty to profess and maintain its principles, and by all the means in our power to promote the knowledge of its sanctifying and comforting doctrines among our fellow-men."

Mr. A. O'D. TAYLOR seconded the resolution, which passed unanimously.

The Rev. C. J. McALESTER rose to offer a resolution to the meeting. He said that those who read the annual reports of the

Society would have observed from year to year a reference to a small Congregation of Christian Unitarians in Girvan, on the coast of Ayrshire. His acquaintance with that small band of disciples had commenced some six or eight years ago, by having received, as Secretary of this Society, a letter from Mr. Matthew Scott, requesting that a minister of our faith from the North of Ireland might occasionally visit them, as some of the members were Irishmen who had settled in Girvan, and to all of them such visits would be acceptable. He accordingly went to Girvan, by direction of the Committee, and made the acquaintance of Mr. Scott, whom he found to be an intelligent and enlightened man, and an earnest Unitarian, familiar with the principles of our faith, and able to defend them. He also found that a neat Church had been erected, capable of accommodating about 150 persons. On its front was the beautifully expressive motto, "God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself," and surmounting it was a stone cross—an emblem of the Christian religion which has been adopted almost exclusively by one denomination, but which might be used by all as the most expressive sign of their faith and hope. Ministers sent by this Society have since, from time to time, visited Girvan; and while the little Church has, by the fluctuations of trade, had its seasons of great depression, Mr. Scott was always found zealous and hopeful. Early in February, Mr. M'Alester went on to say, he had gone to Girvan, and had preached twice on the Sunday. Mr. Scott was at that time in vigorous health, and busied with plans for the promotion of religious truth. His mind had been rendered anxious by the growing tendency in the Unitarian Church to Parkerism and unbelief, and he was resolved to use all the powers he possessed to check the spread of these unscriptural views. He availed himself of his being there to have his infant and only child baptized; the occasion was in every respect an interesting and gratifying one, but had he (Mr. M'A.) known that the wife was so soon to be a widow and the child an orphan, it would indeed have been a melancholy service. Mr. Scott the next day accompanied him to Paisley, where there is a small but most earnest Church of our faith, and introduced him to the lay minister and other friends there. A few days after, Mr. Scott was seized with a malignant fever, caught in the discharge of his duties as Inspector of the Poor, to which he fell a victim. The sorrow that pervaded the town of Girvan when the news of his death became known, abundantly testified the respect in which he was held. Two lessons his life and death convey to the survivors. It is obvious that if they are faithful to their convictions, and act out the holy principles of their Unitarian faith, cherishing "the truth in love," others, no matter how widely they dissent from their theology, will admit their honesty, and respect their character. And further, the unexpected removal of their brother should admonish all to be earnest and active, diligently improving the opportunities they enjoy, as they do not know how soon death may terminate their season of probation. Mr. M'Alester apologized for having trespassed so long on the meeting, and moved,—“That we desire to record our sincere sorrow at the recent death of our

esteemed brother, Mr. Matthew Scott, of Girvan; to acknowledge our deep sense of the important services which he rendered to the cause of Christian Unitarianism in Scotland; and to convey to the small band of disciples to whom he ministered, our sympathy with them in the removal of their pastor, and our desire by every means in our power to encourage them in maintaining in Girvan the public worship of one God the Father, through one Lord Jesus Christ."

Mr. J. KENNEDY seconded this resolution, and, after expressing concurrence in Mr. M'Alester's remarks, read some extracts from one of Mr. Scott's published tracts, showing the ability with which he had combatted prevailing opinions.

Mr. R. M'CALMONT desired to add a sentence or two to the testimony already borne to Mr. Scott's worth. He was occasionally in Girvan, and had made Mr. Scott's acquaintance; he believed him to be a good and earnest man. Mr. Scott had deplored to him the dissension that prevailed among the Unitarians in the North of Ireland, had said that there was really no difference between the parties, and earnestly desired that their unseemly divisions should be healed, and peace restored.

The Rev. J. S. PORTER expressed gratification at the tribute which Mr. M'Calmont had borne to Mr. Scott's worth, but he regretted to be obliged to dissent from one expression he had used, namely, that in Mr. Scott's opinion there was no difference between the parties into which the Unitarian Church in the North of Ireland was divided, for he had heard from Mr. Scott's own lips the most clear and strongly-expressed opinion as to the great importance of the points on which they were divided.

Mr. M'CALMONT repeated the statement he had made, and added that Mr. Scott had informed him that Mr. M'Alester said there was little or no difference between them; and he now begged to ask Mr. M'Alester did not Mr. Scott say so?

Mr. M'ALESTER replied that he could not of course say what Mr. Scott may have told Mr. M'Calmont. He had, however, the highest opinion of Mr. Scott's veracity, and he knew that he regarded the differences that divided the Unitarian body in Ireland as most important: he knew this from frequent and serious conversation with him, and it was further evident from a letter which Mr. Scott wrote to *The Unitarian Herald*. That journal declined its publication, and it was printed in *The Christian Unitarian* of January: its title is "*Unitarianism and Parkerism*," and is signed "*A Lay Preacher*." Mr. M'Alester said, as for himself, his opinions on these matters, be they right or wrong, should be pretty well known: he was not in the habit of concealing them. He had spoken them and written them often enough: and he jocularly remarked, that if ever he uttered the opinion Mr. M'Calmont imputed to him, he certainly could not have been *sober*.

A Committee of fourteen members, with a Treasurer and Secretary, was then balloted for. The Hon. William Porter was moved to the second chair, and a vote of thanks passed by acclamation to Mr. Andrews for his conduct in the chair, and for the valuable aid which for so many years he has rendered to the Society.

[In reference to the latter part of the proceedings reported above, there appears, appended to a brief and incorrect notice of the meeting in a cotemporary periodical, the following sentence:—

“ We have been informed that Mr. M'Alester has since acknowledged that he did make a statement to the late Mr. Scott, substantially the same as that expressed by Mr. M'Calmont, and that his repudiation of the statement at the public meeting arose from a misapprehension.”

In explanation of this extraordinary paragraph, we have to state that on the Thursday evening after the meeting, Mr. M'Alester, in conversation with Mr. M'Calmont, expressed his regret that their statements should have been so opposite, and said that possibly he might have misapprehended an opinion which he (Mr. M'A.) had expressed to many persons, and very likely to Mr. Scott also, that between the ministers of the Northern Presbytery, and some who remained in the Presbytery of Antrim, he believed there was no material difference in doctrinal opinion; and Mr. M'A. added that he was the more particular in making this statement, as he had been most unjustly accused of representing those who remained in the Presbytery of Antrim as sceptics and deists. But he went on to say to Mr. M'Calmont, that he regarded the difference between the two parties as one of vital importance, so much so, that long before the disruption took place, he had made up his mind to withdraw from the Presbytery, if it should appear that its pulpits were open to those who did not acknowledge the divine mission of the Saviour. Mr. M'Calmont observed that in consequence of the dissensions in the Unitarian Church, a most favourable opportunity had been lost of spreading liberal opinions in Ulster; and Mr. M'Alester replied that he deeply deplored the disagreements that had arisen, and especially the personal strife and alienations to which they had led; but, painful as he felt these to be, he would bear them very cheerfully, if thus the spread of those deistical opinions, which some seemed to approve, should be in any degree prevented. Other remarks of a similar kind were made, all tending to shew how important Mr. M'Alester considered the difference to be, and it must thus be seen that the conversation between him and Mr. M'Calmont, so far from leading the latter to suppose that Mr. M'Alester saw no difference, was calculated to produce the very opposite impression. It may be said, that as the matter now rests, it is just Mr. M'Alester's word against Mr. M'Calmont's; but it is more. Mr. M'Calmont is contradicted not merely by Mr. M'Alester's decided expression of opinion at the interview referred to, but by his uniform conduct, since the questions that have disturbed the Church arose—his distinct and unequivocal expression of opinion at several meetings of Presbytery—his statement to his own Congregation, afterwards published—his expressed resolution to resign his congregation, painful though the sacrifice would be, and to retire from the Church rather than be a party directly or indirectly to what he felt to be a betrayal of Christian principles,—and the repeated expressions of opinion which, from month to month, have appeared from his pen in the *Christian Unitarian*. With regard to the late Mr. Scott, we believe that *he* never uttered the sentiment

which Mr. M'Calmont imputes to him; he felt the difference between the parties to be of the utmost moment; and so far from desiring to sink them for sake of an apparent union, he considered that at any sacrifice the divine authority of revelation should be maintained as the basis of our Christian Church. He thus writes, in a letter which was published in this magazine:—"For many years I have laboured, according to my humble ability, to promote the faith in Christ as held by Unitarians, and to defend it against orthodox misrepresentation; . . . and should necessity arise for defending that faith, which I hold dearer than life, against Parkerism taught under the Unitarian name, I will not shrink from the task. It seems high time that those who value the Christian Scriptures as a record of divine revelation should see to their position, and speak out plainly." In various conversations which we had with Mr. Scott, and in several letters which we had from him, he has expressed himself with equal clearness and decision; and in the last short letter which he wrote to us, when the disease, to which a few days after he fell a victim, had already assailed him, he writes thus, alluding to a lengthened discussion which he had had, more than a year ago, with Mr. M'Calmont on these very matters, "I had almost forgotten to say that we had a visit from Mr. M'Calmont of Belfast, and that we fought our battles o'er again." We have no means of exactly determining who supplied the information contained in the paragraph we have been criticizing, but we are driven to the painful conclusion that there has been want of truth in some quarter. We can understand men taking the most opposite views on any religious question, and we can respect the conscientious convictions of our brethren, no matter how widely they differ from us in one direction or another, although we cannot join in spreading views which we believe to be erroneous, or compromise the essential principles of a divine revelation, by making them "an open question;" but we cannot understand how any man who recognizes those principles of morality which are accepted alike by Christian and Jew, by Deist and Atheist, can be guilty of such unscrupulous misrepresentation as we have now been compelled to notice.—ED. CH. UN.]

THE REV. JOHN JENNINGS.

The Rev. John Jennings lately resigned the pastoral charge of the Remonstrant Congregation, Crumlin, and has entered on his duties as minister of the Congregations of Hastings and Battle, Sussex. We wish him every success in his new sphere of duty.

THE REV. JOHN FERRAR.

The Rev. John Ferrar, till recently a clergyman of the Established Church, and for several years curate of Pettigo, County Donegal, has embraced Unitarian views, and officiated on Sunday, May 10th, in the Second Meeting-house, Belfast, and on Sunday, May 17, morning and evening, in the Unitarian Chapel at Ipswich.

THE BALLYCLARE CASE.

This important case has been for several days before the Master of the Rolls. At the time we go to press it has not closed. The report of the proceedings which appears in the daily papers, and a fuller report which is likely to be issued, will sufficiently inform our readers respecting it. We greatly regret the expense which protracted legal proceedings must necessarily have involved. We regret still more the inconvenience to which the great majority of the Ballyclare Congregation, represented by the Relators in the case, have been put; but the principle for which they contend is important, and let the decision of the Court be what it may, they must feel that it is worth maintaining at any sacrifice. We may see occasion, in our next number, briefly to review the several points raised on both sides.

 OBITUARY.

Died, at Farmhill, Dunmurry, on May 13, Sarah, daughter of the late Mr. Hugh M'Kibben, of Willowbank, and Mill Street, Belfast, and formerly Commander R.N.

Died, at Beech Cottage, Warrenpoint, on May 13, the Rev. James Lunn, Presbyterian Minister of Carlingford, in the 89th year of his age. [We hope to publish, in next number, a fuller obituary notice of Mr. Lunn.]

Died, at Glenarm, on May 9, Lizzie, youngest daughter of the Rev. James Callwell, in her 7th year.

 TO CORRESPONDENTS.

We have received a letter from the Rev. James Orr, in which he denies that he was the author of the letter signed "Mary Anne M'Kittrick" in our February number, "save in the sense of acting as amanuensis for his sister-in-law in preparing the letter for the press." As Dr. Montgomery attributed the authorship to Mr. Orr, it is only justice to publish his denial of the charge; but we cannot insert his letter, as we have already signified our determination to bring the controversy to a close.

"A Disciple of Christ"—What does it mean?" "What our Neighbours think of us;" "The Sunday School, its Origin and Aim;" and other Articles, are held over for want of space.

Communications for the Editor, to be addressed by post to Rev. C. J. M'Alester, Holywood; or, otherwise, to 45, Arthur Street, Belfast.

Orders for the work and business communications to be sent to the Agent of the Unitarian Society, 45, Arthur Street.

THE
CHRISTIAN UNITARIAN.

VOL. II.]

JULY, 1863.

[No. 6.]

DISCIPLESHIP AND CREEDS.

To say "I am a disciple of Christ" is the latest form of *creed* adopted by those who arrogate to themselves the name of liberal Christians, and refuse to be hampered by giving assent to any *human* creed. Yet surely this is as much a human creed as the "three questions." To be a disciple of Plato, implies the adoption of Plato's philosophical notions. In like manner, the disciple of Locke would be understood to maintain his opinion of the origin of our ideas—the disciple of Berkeley to stand up for the non-existence of matter. A disciple of Newton rejecting the doctrine of universal gravitation would be looked upon as an absurdity. Thus, in theology, the disciple of Calvin adheres to the five points of Calvinism—of Luther, to consubstantiation. Now we are not at liberty to depart from this universal principle in ascertaining the meaning of "a *disciple* of Christ." He must believe in the reality of Christ's history: he cannot question his veracity when he pretends to be his disciple. What Christ states concerning himself, his authority, his powers, his disciple must admit to be true; consequently he must believe that he is "the Son of God," that he did "works that none other man did," that he went about "healing all manner of sickness and all manner of diseases among the people," that "all judgment was committed to him," that "authority was given him to execute judgment," and so forth.

Christ's disciples must also believe what those assert to whom he gave authority to teach his doctrines; and this involves a belief in the testimony that they bore to his resurrection and to the miracles that he wrought; to the belief that Jesus Christ was the Son of God, through

belief in whom they might have everlasting life, and that he “both died, and rose, and revived, that he might be Lord both of the dead and living,”—and vastly more to the same purpose.

How comes it, then, that adopting the appellation of “disciples of Christ,” they repudiate the profession of belief in the doctrines that Christ and his apostles taught? If the question, “Are you a disciple of Christ?” imply what has been just stated, and we do not think that this can be questioned, why do they refuse their assent to any of the questions included in it? If they say that they would not answer even this question, it then becomes a matter for the consideration of a Christian Congregation whether such a person is a fit and proper person for teaching the Christian religion or conducting Christian worship. If they say that they will answer all questions to the Congregation, but to no one else; then they are to consider, whether—if answering questions be the same as subscribing a creed—it is not as much a “subscribing” when required to answer by a Congregation as by any other body. We have no doubt that the original Non-Subscribers would have refused to bind themselves to any Congregation to make the Westminster Confession of Faith the rule of their preaching, as they did to the Synod of Ulster.

The truth is suspected to be, that they use the designation “disciple of Christ” in a merely conventional sense, and not according to its genuine appropriate meaning: that it is to be understood merely as classifying them among members of the Christian community, and not as Jews, Mahometans, or Deists. They act thus on the plea of refusing to answer any inquiries for the satisfaction of those into whose society they wish to come: as if the candid avowal of their opinions or sentiments were a subscription to a creed, in any sense in which such subscription can be understood as being the authority or rule of their religious teachings. It is clear that it is in the sense of being the rule of their future opinions and future teachings that subscription to the Thirty-Nine Articles is understood in the Ecclesiastical Courts of the Episcopal Church, notwithstanding the reservation in 6th Article that “whatever is not read in Holy Scripture, or may be

proved thereby, is not to be required of any man that it should be believed as an Article of the Faith." In the same sense it is that the Westminster Confession of Faith is understood in the Church of Scotland and the General Assembly of Presbyterians in this country, notwithstanding the answer in the Catechism that "the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament are the Word of God, the only rule of faith and obedience."

If it had not been for the artful association of the "three questions" and "persecution" as synonymous, and the uncandid concealment of real opinions and the refusal to acknowledge Christ, as of the same meaning with "non-subscription to creeds:" the true tendency of the recent proceedings in this matter would have been even more generally understood than it is now beginning to be, among those who were seduced by the plausible plea of resisting persecution for conscience' sake. And any person who has read the Westminster Confession, with its dogmatical decisions on so many abstruse and disputable questions—and it was to this that the refusal to subscribe originally referred,—or who may have read the Thirty-Nine Articles of the Episcopal Church, will at once see the difference between such restrictions on the liberty of thought, and the candid open avowal of their sincere attachment to the Gospel of Christ, according to its obvious and distinctly implied purport.

We had written thus far when we happened upon a strong instance of the imprudence of lawyers venturing to pronounce decisions beyond their own appropriate sphere. The legitimate province of the lawyers is concerned with the legal bearings of words and forms of language in civil rights, contracts, engagements, Acts of Parliament, &c.; the interpretation of which often depends upon the usage of courts of law and previous decisions in analogous cases; and the opinion of an able lawyer upon such matters is of great importance, and carries along with it great weight. But so far are these pursuits from imparting any aptitude for deciding the meaning of theological words or theological usages, that the more thoroughly a lawyer is imbued with legal technicalities and absorbed in legal studies, the less able is he to comprehend matters that seem very plain to ordinary

persons; and no case involving an acquaintance with theological subjects comes before the courts of law without witnessing the absurd mistakes that are often committed.

The instance to which we refer is the answer recently given to the following query:—Do the three questions [viz., of the Remonstrant Code of Discipline] to be put to candidates for the ministry, as set out in the New Code, constitute a human creed? Answer, “We are of opinion that affirmative answers to these questions constitute a human creed.”

Have these lawyers any legal definition of a “human creed”? We suspect not; and if there be any, it must be in Ecclesiastical Law; and even this is out of their province. All creeds must be “human,” so far as they are expressed in words; for language is the peculiar property of the human being. As to the word “creed” itself, it is applicable in various ways; for there may be a political creed, a philosophical creed, a medical creed, and a creed on any other subject that admits of division into different systems or theories. It is with a theological creed that we are now concerned, and we apprehend that Ecclesiastical History will shew that the controversy regarding subscription to creeds had specific reference to three creeds, viz., the Apostles’, the Nicene, and the Athanasian. And we think that the word “creed,” in theological controversy, ought to be applied to these three, or, at most, to others bearing analogy to them in the systematic and dogmatic decision of controverted questions.

But we may suppose that by a “human” creed they meant to signify a creed imposed by human authority, and though we think that a legal opinion ought to be expressed in more definite and perspicuous language, we may consider their opinion in this view. Now supposing these “three questions” to be a creed, which in any proper use of the word they are not; do the affirmative answers to them rest upon human authority, or do they merely testify before men the acknowledgment of the obligation to the highest authority that we can have in such matters? It is stated in that authority that, “he that cometh to God *must* believe that He is.” Is not this an imperative obligation prior to any question asked by a Presbytery, or does his affirmative answer bind him to an

assent to which he is not already bound, or that he is at liberty afterwards to deny? It is further stated, "that if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved." Now, to make no mention of other expressions equally strong, can the imperativeness implied in these words be increased by answering the question, "Do you believe in the Divine mission and authority of the Lord Jesus Christ as the Son of God and Saviour of the world?" So that the authority upon which the answers to these questions rest is not, in the meaning annexed to the words, a "human" authority, nor the affirmative answer in any sense a human creed. As to the third question, since it is only the acknowledgment of the authority of the highest court of appeal that we not only acknowledge but boast of, we see not how the affirmative answer to it can be called a "human creed."

But we have not yet done with these queries and their answers; for we must now revert to the first, which we should not have passed over. It runs thus—"Has the Remonstrant Synod departed from its fundamental principles by the framing of the New Code of Discipline? or are the testing questions contained in it incompatible with the fundamental principles?" Answer, "We are of opinion that the New Code involves a departure in principle from the fundamental principles of the Remonstrant Synod, and that it is not consistent with these principles to require from candidates, as an indispensable qualification for their ordination, affirmative answers to the questions referred to."

We strongly suspect that the querists have not acted fairly to their Counsel in the case which they submitted; for if they had directed their attention to the whole of the fundamental principles, even the contracted habits of legal interpretation might have led them to a sounder opinion. Reference to a *New* Code presupposes that there was an *Old* one, and the natural course for a lawyer to take was to compare the one with the other. In the "Transcript of the Fundamental Principles and Regulations of the Remonstrant Synod of Ulster, as the same were deliberately, solemnly, and unanimously ratified by

that Body at the time of its original formation in May, 1830," printed by order of the Synod as an appendix to their minutes in 1839, with a further instruction "to have a thousand additional Transcripts printed in a detached form, so that they may be disseminated as occasion shall require:" in this Transcript, if anywhere, we are to look for the fundamental principles of the Body; and we presume that, by "departing from its fundamental principles by the framing of the New Code of Discipline," the Querists meant a departure on the side of greater stringency. Now, the 10th Fundamental Principle is, "That we adopt the Code of Discipline sanctioned by the General Synod of Ulster in 1824." At this meeting the Carrickfergus Congregation belonged to the Body, and their minister was a consenting party to this Fundamental Principle. Now the Old Code required Presbyteries to "ascertain the soundness of their faith" in candidates for license to preach, in one of two ways, either (1) by requiring subscription to the Westminster Confession of Faith, or (2) by such examinations as they shall consider best adapted for this purpose. The *questions* proposed to the candidate, and his answers, which were to be *satisfactory* to the Presbytery, "respecting his religious belief," were to be recorded in the Presbytery Book, "*signed by himself* and witnessed by the Moderator." The record of his license was ordered to be entered on the minutes in a prescribed form, stating, among other particulars, that the Presbytery had received satisfactory evidence of his soundness in faith by . . . his answers to the *questions* proposed; and in the entry of this record, two-thirds of the Presbytery must concur. These conditions were required for license to preach. But, as if this was not sufficient, it was further required that, at the time of ordination, for the satisfying of the Presbytery and people, the candidate should be examined touching his belief in the heads of the Christian religion, and other matters. This examination was to be by *questions*, of which the first and second are as follows: "Do you believe the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament to be the Word of God, and the only infallible rule of faith and practice? Do you adhere to your subscription to the Westminster Confession of Faith? or (as the case may be) do you

adhere to the declaration of religious belief made to your Presbytery at the time you were licensed?" The answers, which were to be "to the satisfaction of the Presbytery," were to be entered on the Presbytery Book.

These were the requirements of the *Old Code*. What are those of the *New*? "Presbyteries, before they license a candidate to preach the Gospel, shall satisfy themselves as to his belief in the divine origin and authority of Christianity. The following questions shall be put: Do you believe that the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament contain a Divine revelation? Do you believe in the Divine mission and authority of the Lord Jesus Christ as the Son of God and Saviour of the world?"

Is there any lawyer, or indeed any man, of the plainest common sense that would pretend that this simple process of the *New Code* was more stringent than the complicated and burdensome one of the *Old*, or that the questions of the *New* were "more testing" than the questions of the *Old*? Is it not evident that the substitution of the *New* was a great and desirable relief, instead of an infringement on liberty, and no departure from their fundamental principles in the contemplation of the queries proposed to Counsel? We can never revert in thought to the controversies that have taken place in the Remonstrant Synod, and the conduct of those Congregations that have separated from it, without feeling more and more convinced that religious liberty was not in any way concerned, but that the whole schism took its rise from personal hostility to one to whom the Body owed a vast debt of gratitude, and to whom they are mainly indebted for their successful exodus from the Synod of Ulster, and for their present standing: that they were actuated not by any zeal for private judgment, but by a desire to mortify and annoy this person, and cause him anxiety and trouble at the end of a long and useful life. And we never cease feeling deepest regret that a majority of the Presbytery of Antrim should have so lowered their high character and sacrificed the best interests of the Presbytery, by becoming the tools of this faction, and compassing their object by insulting conduct to some of their oldest and most valuable members.

NOT YET.

Not yet;—along the purpling sky
 We see the dawning ray,
 But leagues of cloudy distance lie
 Between us and the day.

Not yet;—the Aloe waits, serene,
 Its promised advent hour,
 A patient century of green
 To one full, perfect flower.

Not yet;—no harvest song is sung
 In the sweet ear of spring,
 Nor hear we, while the blade is young,
 The reaper's sickle swing.

Not yet;—before the crown, the cross;
 The struggle ere the prize;
 Before the gain the fearful loss;
 And death ere paradise.

CONGREGATIONAL MEMOIRS.

BALLYCARRY (OR BROADISLAND) CONGREGATION.

(Continued from p. 162.)

V.—WILLIAM GLENDY,* 1812 to 1853.

"GLENARM, *May 5, 1812.*—Commissioners from the Congregation of Broadisland requested that the Presbytery would procure them a hearing for four Lord's days of Mr. Glendie (*sic*), a young man under the care of the Presbytery of Derry, which was granted, and that Presbytery written to accordingly.

"LARNE, *May, 1812.*—*Pro re nata.* Mr. Glendie delivered a submission sermon, and was appointed to preach four Lord's days in Ballycarry. A Committee of Presbytery was appointed to take the minds of the people.

"BALLYCARRY, *June 10, 1812.*—At a meeting of Committee of Presbytery, Mr. Thompson (Larne) presented a call, which was unanimously signed in favour of Mr. Glendy. Mr. Glendy was appointed a piece of second trials, which he delivered at Ballynure, in June, 1812. This piece of trial being considered and approved of, his other piece for ordination was appointed to be delivered in Cookstown, June 30, 1812. This specimen was also considered

* A native of Faughanvale, County Derry.

and approved of, and his ordination appointed at as early a day as might suit the convenience of the people of Broadisland. Mr. Thompson to serve the edict, Mr. Cooke* (Donegore) to preach, Mr. Nathaniel Alexander (Crumlin) to ordain and give the charge.

"BALLYCARRY, *July 30, 1812.*—Mr. Bankhead being asked whether all accounts between him and the Congregation of Broadisland were satisfactorily settled, answered they were. Commissioners being asked the annual stipend which the Congregation would promise to Mr. Glendy, replied that they would not pledge themselves to pay more than £50, but would use their utmost exertions to have that sum augmented at as early a day as possible. Mr. Glendy having signified his consent for ordination, Mr. Cooke preached, and Mr. N. Alexander ordained and gave the charge."

In addition to the foregoing record (which is rather meagre) of Mr. Glendy's ordination, I may mention that that event was celebrated in verse as well as prose. An "Address to the Rev. William Glendy, on his being ordained pastor of the Parish of Broadisland," appears amongst "the Posthumous Works of James Orr"—the Burns of Ballycarry—and is not unworthy of the pen which wrote "The Irishman." It is too long to insert here entire, but the local interest connected with the writer and the subject may excuse the quotation of a few verses. It begins—

"Though rash men from the scorner's chair have hurled
At all the Priesthood satire's hissing dart,
Their wild experiments would shew the world
That, wanting temples, wisdom would depart.

"To wisdom's temple guide, then, good Glendy,
Degenerate minds whom error's toils ensnare;
Denounce the guilty, soothe the sufferer's sigh,
Respect the laws, and reverence freedom fair.

"A Sunday-School shall thee as founder hail,
A reading circle's ruler thou shalt be;
To parts a patron, to diseases pale
A rare physician, kind without a fee.

* * * * *

"And may Broadisland's fane, in which of old
The first Dissenter preached on Erin's plain,
For faithful Teachers be through time extolled,
And Congregations free from falsehood's stain."

Mr. Glendy being ordained in 1812 as assistant to Mr. Bankhead, and Mr. Bankhead surviving until 1833, it will

* Now Dr. Cooke of Belfast.

be seen that the former was for twenty-one years an assistant minister. During this time he was, of course, "kept out of the Bounty" (to use a familiar expression which plainly enough describes what appears to me to be a very injudicious and injurious arrangement in the Irish Presbyterian Church); but, in addition to the promised stipend which, for a time at least, seems to have been paid pretty regularly, he had also the use of the minister's house and farm; Mr. Bankhead, agreeably to his own proposal, having given them up to the young man, and removed to an adjoining property, which is still in the possession of his family. The first entry in the Presbytery Book, with respect to Broadisland, after Mr. Glendy's ordination, refers to a Visitation Presbytery, and is as follows:—

"BALLYCARRY, *August*, 1814.—It appeared that the Congregation of Broadisland had regular notice of the meeting. The Session returned as Commissioners Messrs. M'Bride and Alex. Horsborough; the Congregation, Messrs. John Allen and John Horsborough. Both Commissioners expressed their full satisfaction with Mr. Glendy as a member of society and a minister of the Gospel. Mr. Glendy also declared himself pleased with the Session and Congregation. A settled account was produced, and is as follows: 'Received from the Committee of the Congregation of Broadisland, or Ballycarry, the sum of Twenty-Five Pounds, being in full for all stipend due me on the 1st May, 1814.—WILL. GLENDY. Ballycarry, July 2, 1814. Present, Edward Howard, Robert Chambers.'"

The following entry also records a visitation at

"BALLYCARRY, 1821.—The Congregation of Ballycarry had regular notice of this meeting as a Visitation Presbytery. Commissioners from Session, Messrs. Alex. Horsborough and Hugh Clanny; from the Congregation, Messrs. John Allen, John Boyle, and John Horsborough. Mr. Glendy having withdrawn, the Commissioners from Session were asked were they satisfied with the conduct of Mr. Glendy as a member of society and a minister of the everlasting Gospel, and answered in the affirmative. He visits the sick when called on; he visits and catechises the Congregation. They said also that they were satisfied with the conduct of the Congregation. When asked if they had a sufficient number of members to constitute a Session, they replied, 'not as many as formerly.' Similar questions were put to the Commissioners from the Congregation, and similar answers received. Mr. Glendy, being called in, gave a truly gratifying account of the behaviour of the Session and attendance of the Congregation. He directed the attention of the Presbytery to the much-improved

state of the Meeting-house, and mentioned the generous donation of Richard Jervis Kerr, Esq., the landlord, of Fifty Pounds, with which the Presbytery was highly gratified. On examining the state of accounts, an arrear of £14 14s 8d appeared to be due to Mr. Glendy at Nov., 1820."

Shortly after the date of the last extract, the name of the minister of Ballycarry was brought before his Presbytery in a manner which, at the time, must have caused him serious annoyance, but which had not the slightest permanently injurious effect upon his reputation. In one point of view the matter here referred to might, in this narrative, have been passed over, for it never cast even the shadow of a cloud upon the fair fame of the minister of Ballycarry; but the circumstances being still locally and traditionally remembered, they are alluded to in this place, because the issue was highly creditable to Mr. Glendy, and because that gentleman left no representative who can be pained by the allusion.

At a *pro re nata* meeting of Presbytery, held in Ballycarry, October 1, 1821, the Moderator stated that he had called the meeting in consequence of a letter he had received from Mr. Glendy, which stated that charges affecting his character and usefulness as a minister, had been circulated against him, and which he wished to have an early opportunity of rebutting and proving to be false and slanderous. The Moderator's conduct was approved of. Mr. Glendy then stated the purport of the *fama clamosa* which had been circulated against him; but as the female implicated, although regularly summoned to attend the Presbytery and substantiate her charge, did not appear, and as no witnesses responded to the Moderator's call to come forward and maintain the accusation, the Presbytery, after hearing evidence from various quarters, (amongst others, Dr. Cooke and Dr. Reid,) highly favourable to Mr. Glendy, and also other evidence very unfavourable to the character of his accuser, unanimously resolved, "That the report circulated against Mr. Glendy is false, scandalous, and malicious; and that he is, in their estimation, honourably and fairly acquitted."

At Parkgate, in Feb., 1822, an attempt was made by the father of the plaintiff to revive the accusation; but it was then "unanimously resolved, that inasmuch as the

letters demanding a re-hearing of the case contained a foul, false, and malicious calumny; and as it would be a violation of discipline to institute a second trial of Mr. Glendy, the prayer of these letters be rejected, and that the letters themselves remain in the possession of the Clerk, for the use of the Presbytery and of Mr. Glendy in particular."

At Newry, June 27, 1822, another memorial from the same person, and on the same subject, was produced, which had been handed to the Moderator by Mr. James Bankhead (Dromore), son of the senior minister of Ballycarry; but "after long and mature deliberation it was resolved unanimously, that as no complaint or appeal had been lodged against the decision of Presbytery in this matter, and as no Commissioner has appeared in support of said paper, the language of which is highly indecorous, we cannot consent to license said paper; and the Moderator is ordered to hold it *in retentis*, and to direct the memorialist how he is to proceed in regular and presbyterial way." He did proceed, although not regularly; for he actually brought the matter before Synod, as appears from the following entry:—

"At BALLYNURE, August 6, 1822.—On reading the minute of Presbytery entered into at Newry, relative to a paper which the Presbytery had declined to license, the Moderator reported that he had instructed memorialist how and in what manner he ought to proceed. Memorialist having declined to do as directed, brought the paper before Synod in some other way, when the Synod ordered that the Presbytery of Templepatrick take no notice of any future application on the subject of said memorial, and that the Clerk of Presbytery, after having taken a copy of it, return the original to the person by whom it is signed, that said copy is to be *in retentis*, and extracts from it given to Messrs. Cooke and Glendy, when called for."

Here this matter finally dropped.

On the 13th May, 1828, a Visitation Presbytery was held at Ballycarry. On this occasion the questions, no less than seventy in number, which the Presbytery had, in the previous year, resolved should be put at all their visitations, were asked seriatim of the Minister and Commissioners from Session and Congregation; the latter being respectively Messrs. John Ridge and John Boyle, James Hopkins and John Hay. The answers to all of

these seventy questions need not here be given. Suffice it to observe that those which concerned the character and conduct of the Minister* and his Session (consisting of eight Elders), as well as the attendance of the Congregation upon their joint ministrations, were highly favourable, except in the case of the observance of family worship by the people; that the Congregation was stated to consist of 500 families, paying an annual stipend of £60 Irish, on which there were no arrears; that their attendance upon public worship "was not so good as it should be," but that generally they were "in their seats at the commencement, and remained there till the conclusion, of divine service;" that the number of Communicants present at the last preceding celebration of the Lord's Supper had been 300; that the number of young communicants who had come forward for the first time during the last year had been 60; that there were within the bounds of the Congregation eight Daily Schools, of which seven were in connexion with the Kildare Place Society; and three Sunday-Schools, which were supported by voluntary contributions; that the tenure by which they held their meeting-house, as well as the lease of the minister's house and farm—which latter were vested in Trustees at an annual rent of £14 Irish,—would expire in November, 1829; and that they were beneficially interested in the following bequests, viz., 1. The Edmon-

* At this Visitation Presbytery, the brethren asserted and exercised the right of inquiring into the moral and religious deportment of the senior Minister, as well as into that of his assistant. Mr. Reid (Moderator) asked the Commissioners from the Session and the Congregation if Mr. Bankhead attended public worship or the sacrament of the Lord's Supper in Ballycarry, and was answered that he had not done so for some years, although the Commissioners had seen him at a funeral a few days ago, when he appeared to hear with tolerable ease. But Rev. Mr. Shaw (Larne) said that Mr. Bankhead had attended on his ministry, and communicated in Larne several times, although Mr. Bankhead had declared that on those occasions he did not hear Mr. Shaw. I fear that these circumstances, taken in connexion with the fact already recorded that Mr. Bankhead's son handed in a memorial against Mr. Glendy, at Newry, in 1822, lead to the inference that the old horse and the young one did not always pull very kindly together in double harness. In fact it would be strange if they did. The very nature of the connexion between senior and assistant minister, as now arranged, would seem almost of necessity to imply jealousy on the one part, and impatience on the other. Exceptions to this rule there have been, but not many if the truth were known.

stone bequest (amount not stated), under the management of the minister and Session for the time being, and appropriated to the education of poor children; 2. Miss Lewis's bequest of One Hundred Pounds late currency, under the management of the minister and Committee, on which four years' interest was then unpaid; and 3. The late Mr. Ker's bequest of Four Hundred Pounds, entrusted to the Vicar and Minister for the use of the poor. It was also stated at this Visitation in 1828, that a Session-Book and a Committee-Book were in existence, and were regularly kept; but of neither of these books can I now find a trace. As to the above-mentioned bequests, their present condition, so far as I have been able to ascertain it, will be found detailed in a note at the foot of the page.*

(*To be continued.*)

* 1. *Edmonstone Bequests.*—ARCHIBALD EDMONSTONE, Esq., of Red Hall, by his will dated September 26, 1758, devised "Ten Pounds to the poor of the Parish of Broadisland," which sum, by a codicil dated March 17, 1766, he afterwards increased to "Twenty Pounds, to be laid out at legal interest by the Dissenting Minister, the Session and Committee of the said Parish of Broadisland as Trustees for said sum for the use of the Poor of said Parish, and the legal interest thereof to be paid yearly for ever." By the same will, Mr. Edmonstone devised "Fifty Pounds to be put out at interest by the Dissenting Minister, and the Session for the time being for the use of a Schoolmaster of the Dissenting Communion in said Parish." He also, by the same instrument, devised "Ten Pounds to buy a Silver Christening Bason, with his arms engraven upon it, for the use of the Meeting-house in said Parish:" and "One Hundred Pounds to help the Fund ordered for the support of Dissenting Ministers' Widows." In the codicil, he mentions with respect to the Christening Bason, that he had "already bought and given said Bason." I have heard that this Bason was bought for the occasion of the baptism of one of Mr. Bankhead's children who was called "ANN EDMONSTONE," after "the Lady" of that name, who also by her will dated July 29, 1777, bequeathed "Twenty Pounds to the Dissenting Minister, Session and Committee for the time being of the Presbyterian Congregation of Broadisland, to be by them lent from time to time, and the interest paid to whoever shall be Schoolmaster in Ballycarry." These various pecuniary bequests would have amounted altogether to £90; viz. £20 to the Poor, and £70 to the Schoolmaster, the interest only to be applicable to the purposes indicated. I have understood that the money, having been lent to a neighbouring gentleman whose affairs became involved, was for some time not productive, and nearly lost. But it was recovered (less £10) by Mr. Bankhead, and a Bond, dated December 31, 1817, was given for the residue (£80) by Richard Gervas Ker, Esq., to "Rev. John Bankhead, and Rev. William Glendy, Ministers for the time being, and Robert M'Bride and John Allen, being of Session and Committee of Broadisland." On this Bond interest continues to be

THE BALLYCLARE CASE.

THIS remarkable and now celebrated case, so important in reference to the principles of Non-Subscription and the rights of congregations, has, during the past month, been heard at great length in the Rolls Court, Dublin; and although the Master of the Rolls has not yet given his formal decision, he has expressed himself in such terms of condemnation with regard to one party, and has so distinctly endorsed the principles maintained by the other, that the advocates of "absolute religious liberty" in Presbyteries, are filled with exultation, and those who maintain as an essential principle of their ecclesiastical constitution, the divine authority of revelation, are, for a season, discomfited. It may be well to review as briefly

paid at 5 per cent. and the proceeds are applied annually by the Minister, Session, and Committee of Ballycarry, according to the Wills of the Testators.

2. "*Miss Lewis's Bequest of One Hundred Pounds, to the Minister and Committee of Ballycarry Congregation.*" On this Legacy four years' interest was due in 1828—as stated in the text; and I fear the principal has now followed the interest. I cannot find any trace of this money, although I have inquired in every quarter where I thought it likely I might obtain information. If it was left to the poor (as in all probability it was) and if, in consequence thereof, the poor should ever "ask for bread," they certainly have been given "a stone;" for in the Old Church Yard of Ballycarry, there is a Tablet with the following inscription: "Within this Vault are deposited the remains of Mrs. Anne Lewis, of Mount Street, Grosvenor Square, London—who died at Red Hall, on 20th March 1819, aged 61 years. She bore a painful and lingering illness with the fortitude, resignation, and piety of a true Christian. In testimony of, and thankfulness for, a sincere and affectionate friendship of the long standing of forty-one years, her body is here placed, and this stone inscribed by Richard Gervas Ker."

3. "*The late Mr. Ker's Bequest of £400 to the Vicar and Minister for the use of the poor.*" Concerning this fund, also, strange to say, nothing appears to be now definitely known; either as to where it is, or how the proceeds are applied. I have been kindly promised assistance in my endeavours to ascertain the present position of these two legacies, and have some hopes of ultimate success. But in the mean time, it is truly wonderful that bequests for the benefit of Ballycarry, the particulars of which were evidently well known in 1828, should, in the short space of 35 years, have passed away entirely out of the knowledge of that generally well-informed personage, "the oldest inhabitant." I believe the present proprietor of the Red Hall Estate, pays annually £10 each to the teachers of the Ballycarry Male and Female National Schools, No. 1. Perhaps this has some connexion with the interest on "the late Mr. Ker's bequest of £400 to the Vicar and Minister for the use of the poor."

as we can the whole case, not for the purpose of questioning the correctness of any legal decision that may be given, but in order to show that, whatever the law may decide, the majority of the Ballyclare Congregation are right in principle, are justified in the course which they have taken, and are entitled to public sympathy in their efforts to maintain their Christian character. It is the more incumbent on us to place the true bearings of this case before the public, as the leading journals of our denomination have laboured persistently and systematically to prejudice the minds of their readers, and to represent the Ballyclare majority as intolerant and persecuting, actuated solely by a desire to ignore their minister, and to drag the Congregation back to the bondage of human creeds and confessions. The principal organ of the English Unitarians has crowned its partisan work by giving a one-sided report of the law proceeding,—a long letter from the member of Ballyclare, proclaiming his victory and abusing his opponents,—and a leading article, characterized by all the virulence for which the editor and his co-adjutors have gained so unenviable a notoriety : and then, the announcement is made that its columns are closed against any further controversy on the subject !

The Rev. John Hall was settled as assistant minister in Ballyclare, in the year 1839, and, as far as we know, discharged his duties with the utmost fidelity for some years. The position he has latterly taken shall not tempt us to utter a syllable calculated unjustly to disparage him, or throw discredit on his ministry. He was a man of unblemished character, frugal and temperate in his habits, anxious, in the earlier period of his ministry, to promote secular education within the bounds of his congregation, and attentive to the humbler classes, by whom, as a natural consequence, he was much beloved. His many good qualities led the people to bear with some peculiarities in their minister, but occasionally he startled and offended them by his eccentricities. He has a taste for natural science, and hence he often introduced subjects of this kind into his discourses. His sermon on a certain Communion Sunday, occupied almost entirely with *the foot of a fly*, and the evidences it affords of wisdom in the Creator, caused much dissatisfaction ; but his hearers were much

more offended on a certain Sunday, by his having a table placed in front of the pulpit, putting a young girl on it with a tin of soap-suds in one hand, and a tobacco pipe in the other, and telling her to blow bubbles, that he might thus illustrate certain properties of the atmosphere !

Some years ago Mr. Hall seems to have adopted the religious opinions of Theodore Parker, or at least to have manifested strong sympathies with them, and hence much uneasiness grew up in the Congregation. There had, indeed, previously arisen considerable disagreement between him and leading members of the Congregation, in reference to an intermediate school, and we remember that a deputation, of whom the late William Archer, Esq. was one, appeared at a Presbytery meeting in 1858, to obtain the advice of the brethren. Mr. Hall has stated, in his letter to *The Inquirer*, that till the late movement in the Presbytery his Congregation was united. He is certainly in error in saying so,—but we attribute this misstatement, not to deliberate falsehood, but to the blinding influence of excited feelings. As a consequence of Mr. Hall's Parkerite opinions, the services on Communion Sunday, June 9, 1861, were most objectionable ; the tendency of his discourse was, in the mind of many, to lower the character of Christ, and detract from the importance of his miracles. Some were further greatly offended by his reading one of Shakespeare's plays, or a large portion of it, from the pulpit on a Sunday ; and by his allowing a Sunday evening service to be conducted in the Session-house by a person who had declared that there was no need of a sacrament, and that any man might be a Saviour. By this time the feeling of the Committee and Session became so strong, in reference to the objectionable proceedings and objectionable opinions of their minister, that they resolved to bring the subject before the Presbytery, and accordingly did so, in October, 1861. The Presbytery endeavoured, by counsel to both parties, to remove the grounds of complaint, and restore peace ; but Mr. Hall's obstinacy baffled all attempts to reconcile them. Very soon after, an application was made by the York Street Congregation to be received into connexion with the Presbytery of Antrim, and as that Congregation had severed its connexion with the Remonstrant Synod of

Ulster, on the ground that that reverend body required from every member to be ordained, an acknowledgment of the divine authority of Revelation, it became a question for serious consideration, whether the principles of the Presbytery of Antrim would justify them in ordaining a minister of the Gospel *on easier terms*. There were circumstances connected with the York Street Congregation which excited the apprehension of some members of Presbytery, including the two oldest ministers of the body. Its previous minister had been known to hold very loose opinions respecting Christ's office, and several of those who had held a prominent place in the Congregation, had been notorious for their scepticism. The Commissioners who attended from the York Street Congregation stated, honestly enough, that they would not allow the minister whom they might choose, to answer any questions, and the reasonableness of this declaration will be obvious from the fact, that one of these Commissioners, not long after, stated it to be the design of himself and others, to build up a Church which should not be exclusively Christian in any sense, and which should not make even the belief in a personal God the basis of union—for that, said he, would be virtually and actually to own a Creed!

The debates which took place at this and the following meeting of Presbytery are familiar to our readers. It was argued, we think with unanswerable force on the one side, that, while the founders of the Presbytery refused subscription to the Westminster Confession, and all other human creeds, they maintained that they should acquaint themselves with the Christian principles of the candidate, before they would ordain him. One of the Six Propositions which embody the original principles of the Presbytery, distinctly implies this; and if there were any doubt on the matter, the following passage from the pen of the Rev. Samuel Haliday, one of the founders of the Presbytery, written at the time when Non-Subscription was warmly discussed, should settle the point:—

“Neither is it my opinion that ministers are obliged immediately to license or ordain any candidate for the ministry if he shall acknowledge the Scriptures to be the Word of God. I think that they may demand some rational satisfaction that the person whom they ordain understands the Christian doctrine, and is apt to teach;

which may be had by examining the person to be ordained, and by allowing him to preach before his ordainers, concerning the most important subjects; or to draw up in his own words an account of the principles and grounds of his faith."

There we have plainly set forth the right of the Presbytery to ascertain the Christian principles of the candidate. On the other side, it was contended that the Presbytery have no business to know the Christian principles of the candidate, but that they are bound to ordain any one whom the Congregation may choose. Those who maintained the ancient principles and practice of the Presbytery were out-voted, and, under a deep sense of duty, constrained to withdraw from a body which, by its vote, had virtually abandoned Christian principles, and thrown its pulpits open for those who should profess anything or nothing. They formed themselves into a new Presbytery, adopting the Original Propositions as their basis, with the exception of a portion of the 4th Proposition, which recommends the Westminster Confession of Faith to the perusal of parents, as containing a good summary of Christian doctrine; and they added a resolution, that they would not license, ordain, or instal any person who did not acknowledge the divine mission of Christ. Such a resolution is implied in the original principles, but a specific statement of it would have been very superfluous at a time when none claimed the Christian name, or sought admission into Christian pulpits, who did not gratefully acknowledge the authority of Revelation, and the divine mission of the Saviour.

It is easy to perceive, from the state of opinion in the Ballyclare Congregation, that the minister and the people would probably take opposite sides, and they did so; for, at a Congregational meeting, held in April, 1862, a large majority of the seatholders resolved to withdraw from the Presbytery: the minister and a small minority opposed this resolution. The Presbytery, at its next meeting, recommended Mr. Hall and his party to elect new officers, and to consider those who voted to withdraw from the Presbytery, as no longer members of the Congregation. The majority, alarmed for their congregational property, kept possession of the meeting-house till some satisfactory arrangement could be made. This step, taken from no

unworthy motive, but purely in self-defence, has created in the public mind a prejudice against them, and has led to much of the difficulty that has since arisen. They took, however, the best advice; and for the protection of the property which they and their forefathers had created, they entered legal proceedings against Mr. Hall and his party. The result, we fear, will be to them most unfavourable, while it is calculated to endanger the liberty of other congregations, and place them at the mercy of any eccentric or whimsical man who may have become their minister. When Mr. Hall told his people from the pulpit, on one occasion, that he was not chosen to teach any particular opinions, and that he would preach just what he pleased, we considered him to be imprudent and impertinent; but it appears that in such a course the law will protect him; and so, if the minister of any Non-Subscribing congregation becomes a Parkerite or a Deist on the one hand, or embraces Roman Catholic tenets on the other, his people must submit to have their souls chilled with the negations of unbelief, or shocked with the dogmas of Popery; and their only relief is, to leave their congregational property and go elsewhere. It may be said that a minister who had any sense of justice would, in such a case, tender his resignation. So he would. And Mr. Hall, in his late letter, says—"Had I been assured, by reasonable evidence, that any considerable portion of my Congregation had any just cause for dissatisfaction against me, I would, most certainly, have resigned my ministerial office, in acknowledgment of the legitimate authority of the people." The same idea he threw out in more homely phrase on one occasion from the pulpit, by telling the people that "he had a free foot and a fellow for it." Such dissatisfaction there was, before any agitation arose in the Presbytery; a large majority was, even then, and a larger majority is now, dissatisfied. Will he still recognize the legitimate authority of the people? We trow not. An unworthy effort has been made to represent the dissatisfied party as inconsiderable, and we have been informed, that a private letter was written to an influential minister in England, stating, that of the 83 names attached to the Resolution of February 2, 1862, withdrawing from the Presbytery of

Antrim, 56 were fraudulently added. We have the best reason to believe that all those signatures were *bonâ fide*; and we greatly regret that it is not in our power to expose the party who was guilty of so gross misrepresentation.

We know that the mass of the people,—the bone and sinew of the Congregation,—its numbers, wealth, intelligence, and respectability, are against Mr. Hall. They are, it seems, to be deprived of their meeting-house and other property, and possibly mulcted in heavy law costs. This is hard, but it is better to bear this and more, than to become parties to a betrayal of Christian principle; and from what we know of the Ballyclare majority, rich and poor, we believe that they will remain firm and united. Though “perplexed,” they are “not in despair,”—though “cast down,” they are “not destroyed.” They will be sustained by the sympathy of their fellow-Christians of all denominations, and by the consciousness that what they suffer is in maintenance of those Gospel principles which they prize, and to which, through all injustice and worldly loss, they resolutely and firmly cling.

We refrain from commenting on the imputation which the Master of the Rolls seems to have cast on the veracity of the members of the Northern Presbytery. The public will be slow to believe that those gentlemen alleged anything in their affidavits but what they knew to be true. We hope the affidavits referred to, and all others connected with the case, may be published; it will then be seen whether there was any just grounds for the grave accusation which has been made against them.

A MISSION TO MOTHERS.

AMID all the controversies which agitate the Christian Church, it is refreshing to know that the spirit of philanthropy which characterizes the Gospel is not stifled, but that in every denomination there are earnest disciples of the Saviour, who seek, by various beneficent schemes, to promote the temporal and spiritual condition of their fellow-creatures. Among the more recent institutions of

a benovelent kind, which may be directly traced to the operation of the Gospel, may be instanced our Reformatories and our Ragged Schools, both designed to influence the young, and lead them into the paths of righteousness. Indeed it has been wisely judged that to elevate the condition of society, and diminish the prevalence of sin, we must endeavour to act on the mind and heart of childhood; but our Reformatories are designed to reclaim those young persons who have already sunk into vice, and our Ragged Schools can only act upon children during the hours in which they are under the charge of the teacher: while there is an education of a very different kind going on in the wretched homes of many of the poor, and hence the best endeavours of the most devoted teachers are so often frustrated. Our Domestic Missions, now to be found in almost every large town, and in connexion with almost every denomination, have no doubt done much to improve the condition of the poor in their homes, and awaken them to a sense of their duties and their responsibilities; but neither the missionary who visits the poor, nor the Ladies' Committee organized to aid him in his work, can enter completely into the wants and feelings, the trials and temptations of the humblest class, and hence—rich though the results of their efforts have been—in many cases they have entirely failed to win the confidence of those whom they desire to help. To meet the want that has existed, and to awaken the closest sympathy between the families of the humblest poor and those who desire to befriend them, a new organization has lately been formed, which, from its relation to institutions already in operation, has been happily called “The Missing Link.”

A benevolent and Christian lady was one summer afternoon walking through one of the most densely peopled and most wretched parts of London in company with a friend, when she expressed a desire to employ some good poor woman to carry a bag of Bibles into the rooms of that crowded district, and to give a faithful report of her efforts to circulate the Sacred Volume, and instruct those who would listen to its comforting and saving truths. The gentleman replied that he knew a middle-aged woman, of deep religious feeling,

schooled herself in adversity and affliction, who would gladly employ some hours daily in such a work. On further inquiry, it was arranged that this person should enter upon the work. She was allowed to choose her own district, and began her mission in Soho, closely bordering on St. Giles's. The tenants were mostly of the very lowest and most degraded classes, yet she went among them, strong in the consciousness that her errand was a holy and a noble one; and into dens of misery which ordinary missionaries would hardly have ventured to enter, into which it may be they would not have gained access, she bravely penetrated. In some of these haunts it was said, "What use is it to come with the Bible here? It is not for such as we are." But then she heard the answer—"Ah! let her come; I wish we were like her!"

"'Do not go up that stair,' said a City Missionary to her one day; 'The woman who lives there is not a woman—she is a fiend. It takes four men to carry her home when she is drunk.' 'It is to such as she I go,' said the quiet visitor, and passed on. When she arrived at the stair-head, she heard the voice of a fury, and tapping at the door, immediately entered. The fierce woman, standing six feet high, stared in amazement at the visitor. A boy of nine years old stood in the corner naked; his mother had just been beating him, after cutting his poor old trousers to ribbons in search of a sixpence, which she said he had stolen, having received it for sweeping a crossing. 'Do not beat him any more,' said she; 'I dare say he will remember this; but what will you do with his trousers? He cannot put them on again;' and turning to the child she added, 'A lady gave me a pair of trousers this morning, but they are for a good boy, if I found him. Could you promise never to keep back the money any more from your mother, if I brought them to *you*?' The offer was so timely, and the voice of kindness so unusual in that apartment, that it melted the child, and even touched the mother. An influence began from that day, alike over mother and children, which has never been quite lost. This woman had been very violent to the visitor on the first weeks of her new vocation, threatening to trample her to pieces, if she came canting into her court."

Wherever the visitor sold a Bible, she continued to visit, and, entering into the circumstances of the family, suggested various plans for improving their condition, by prudently applying their little earnings, promoting the cleanliness and comfort of their dwellings, and showing them arts of cooking which, without increasing the cost, added greatly to the comfort and wholesomeness of their frugal meal. The improvement in the home seems, in

many cases, to have acted most favourably upon the husband, and to have weaned him from the gin-shop, while on the children the change in the dwelling and in the habits of the mother exercised an influence more salutary than either Ragged-school or Sunday-school.

The agency thus started, and found to be efficacious, was taken up by Christian people of several denominations, so that now there are many Bible-women engaged in this "mission to mothers," and labouring not only in the metropolis, but in many other districts, to promote the spiritual improvement and the physical elevation of the poor. Our object in drawing attention at present to this interesting organization is, to introduce the subject to our readers in connection with the Domestic Mission which is sustained by the members of our denomination in Belfast. That institution, largely endowed by the munificent gift of one individual, and sustained by the generous subscriptions of many, is calculated to achieve much good, especially as it enjoys the devoted services of a Missionary, well qualified by his previous experience, earnest sympathy, and evangelical ministrations, to carry on the good work. But we welcome with sincere delight the addition to its other instrumentalities of a "Mission to Mothers," similar to that which, in other places, and among other denominations, has been found so useful. This project was, some months ago, brought before the Ladies' Committee by one of its members in a communication, of which the following is an extract:—

"In fact, the influence of Woman is needed to re-model comfortless homes, and show how little children should be cared for. And since it happens that many of us are precluded, by the claims of nearer duties, from undertaking in our own persons this office of monitor and friend, might we not, by uniting to form a small annual subscription, send among our poor neighbours a Missionary of their own rank, yet of superior mental and moral qualifications, who would be able to effect more than a lady could in most cases, and to penetrate into places where a lady could scarcely venture. So much, we know, has been done in London and elsewhere by means of this agency, which has been justly called 'The Missing Link,' that its efficacy will probably be unquestioned; and there can be little doubt that such a person, if appointed, would greatly increase the usefulness of our Mission. This branch of the work might, with great propriety, be inaugurated and carried on by the Ladies of our Committee and Congregations.

"The self-styled 'Evangelical' denominations have their emis-

saries busy in several districts of this town, and we must admit their *practice*, if not their doctrine, to be evangelical. No doubt *we*, being a very practical people, may commence by distributing Sanitary Tracts, patterns for Clothing, or receipts for Cookery; but after all, this is but the beginning to a gradual advance towards a better state of things—a preparation for the reception of spiritual truth. It is a great thing to inspire the Poor with a hope of *bettering* themselves—to shew them that a nobler, happier life is possible for them even in this world,—to encourage aspiration, and teach them that their poor, but not necessarily wretched homes, may be brightened by the smile of God.

“A kind *poor* woman, who has been chastened in the school of suffering, and knows by experience the reality of the religious truths she would impress, would prepare many an ignorant and neglected one to enjoy and profit by Mr. Bowring’s services, and these combined influences could hardly fail to alter for the better the whole domestic life.

“Can we conscientiously maintain that there are difficulties in the way sufficient to deter us from making the attempt?”

As the reasonable result of this powerful and touching appeal, the scheme was heartily taken up by the Committee, and already the organization has been completed, and a suitable agent has been employed. She has instructions to call on the families at present connected with the mission, and on others in the district, and to ascertain in every case if the family possess a Bible, and if not, to endeavour to induce them to trust her with instalments for the purchase of one. She is furnished with a bag, containing her account-books, tracts for lending, and a Bible, out of which she is to read wherever a desire is expressed that she should do so. In any special case of sickness or destitution she is to consult the missionary, or the ladies of the Visiting Committee; and one or two bags of baby-linen are provided for lending a month at a time, for the loan of which a small sum is to be paid by the mother.

That this interesting plan will obtain the hearty sympathy and the generous assistance of the present supporters of the Mission, and of others who hitherto have not interested themselves in it, there is little room to doubt; for we do not know any effort for ameliorating the condition of the poor, and awakening them to a sense of their responsibilities, more reasonable in its plans, or more practical in its application, than this “Mission to Mothers.”

OUR ANNUAL MEETINGS.

THE Annual Meeting of the Remonstrant Synod, and also that of the Non-Subscribing Association, take place in the course of the present month, and the events of the past year must lead the members to look forward to them with much interest, and not without some anxiety. In the Remonstrant Synod we presume that the "Three Questions" will be again discussed, and another effort will be made to modify them, especially as a legal opinion has been published, to the effect that they involve a "human creed," and if that opinion be correct, they are a violation of a fundamental principle of the Synod, and may seriously affect certain trusts connected with it. Some may advocate such a modification of the "Three Questions" as may reduce them to something like the one agreed on at the Peace Conference in March, 1862: the word "only" in that Question should be no difficulty, as it is evidently used merely in a *Protestant* sense, and might be so explained. Others may recommend that the Synod should fall back to the position which it held before the introduction of the New Code, and thus get rid of all disagreement. Such a course should satisfy the advocates for the Three Questions; and, if the opposite party be pleased, there is an end to all discussion, and peace is at once restored. A third party, of whom the Rev. Thomas Smyth would possibly be the leader, may propose that both Old Code and New should be kicked to the winds, and that the Scriptures should not be maintained as "the rule of faith;" for he tells us that "men are no longer disposed to lay stress upon the authority of a book, however sacred it may be considered; they rely upon the spirit of love to God and love to man, which lie at the root of Christianity itself." This course would certainly give a *broader* foundation to the Synod, but it would be, "out of the frying-pan into the fire;" for those members who jealously guard the original principles of the Synod, and cannot brook the smallest modification of them, would fill Ulster with their protests against a measure that would sweep away the Scriptures, and would strip the Church of every just claim to be considered "exclusively Christian in any sense." We believe, however, that the desire of the majority of the ministers, and still more of the laymen, on both sides, is to maintain the Christianity of the Church, and, however they may modify its regulations, to rest it on the divine authority of revelation: and we hope some course may be struck out which shall meet the scruples of the discontented, and, at the same time, leave its Christian basis undisturbed.

A question of somewhat the same kind may arise in the Non-Subscribing Association. The Northern Presbytery, with whom a considerable number of the Association sympathize, insist on every candidate whom they license or ordain, signifying his belief not in the Deity or Divinity, but in the *Divine Mission* of the Saviour. A high legal authority has, within the last few weeks, declared that such a requirement is as much a "Creed" as is the Westminster Confession of Faith, and is a violation of the principle of Non-Subscription. It is true, indeed, that the founders of the

Presbytery of Antrim thought very differently, and maintained that the candidate for ordination should not only satisfy the congregation, *but his ordainers*, of his qualifications for preaching the Gospel; and it is also true that the Northern Presbytery are not bound, and will not be bound, by the opinion of any lawyer respecting the principles which they shall hold: but while such an opinion has been expressed from the bench, and many ministers of the Association also entertain it, can they continue to recognize the Northern Presbytery as a component part of their body? We believe, however, that even of the present members of the Presbytery of Antrim, a considerable number would not feel themselves justified in ordaining any candidate of whose faith in the Divine Mission of Christ they were not satisfied, and hence they represented Mr. M'Alester's motion, offered to the Presbytery in January, 1862, as containing "unfounded imputations" against them. If they really feel indignant at being supposed capable of ordaining any one of whose Christian belief, as expressed in that resolution, they were not fully satisfied, might not some course be struck out which would allow the utmost freedom within the bounds of Christianity, and yet at the same time uphold in the face of the world, amid all our varieties of opinion, our boasted adhesion to the Scriptures as not *being*, indeed, but as *embodying*, a Divine Revelation. Such a measure would be welcomed by the great mass of the laity, and might do much to restore harmony to a Church whose principles are essentially Christian and thoroughly free.

Without some more clearly defined ground of union than at present exists between the different bodies which compose the Association, there can be no hearty co-operation; and it would be better for the peace of the Churches, and for the comfort of the ministers, that meetings should be no longer annual, but should be held when some matter affecting their civil rights might render it desirable for them to meet.

WHAT OUR NEIGHBOURS THINK OF US.

Most of our readers are probably aware that the Unitarian Congregation of Strand Street, Dublin, have erected a new and beautiful church in Stephen's Green, and that they have adopted a Book of Prayer, in the belief that it will be an aid in the devotional part of their service. A Church of England magazine thus notices these matters:—

"We live in strange times. We confess to a considerable amount of surprise when the New Unitarian Church (meeting-houses are things that were) first raised its graceful proportions in Stephen's Green, and we observed the symbol of Christianity exhibited in various parts of it. What have the Unitarians to do with the cross? This enigma is now followed up by another, no less difficult of solution,—a Book of Common Prayer, adapted for the use of the church with the crosses, and which, but for some variation, might be used in the most orthodox Church in Christendom."

If those who thus criticize would so far overcome their prejudices as to pay a visit to this new church, now opened for divine service,

they would find that the cross is no unapt emblem of the Unitarian's faith, and that worship is offered there in accordance with the teachings of the Gospel. Unitarians do not indeed regard the cross as suggesting a dying God, or even an angry God appeased; neither do they worship a "holy, blessed, and glorious Trinity," or consign to everlasting perdition those who do not worship God as they do: but with these exceptions, it may be found that the service in a Christian Unitarian Church, with or without a Book of Prayer, is very like that which is observed "in the most orthodox Church in Christendom."

THE REV. JOHN HALL AND HIS CONGREGATION.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CHRISTIAN UNITARIAN.

DEAR SIR,—I observe a letter in *The London Inquirer* of the 6th inst., signed "John Hall," in which the writer alleges that there was no dissatisfaction toward him in the Congregation until after the dinner to Mr. Dundee, in the Court-house of Ballyclare, on November 18th, 1861. Mr. Hall knows quite well, and so do the ministers of the Presbytery of Antrim, that this statement is untrue. On July 7th, 1858, a deputation, consisting of three members of the Committee, waited on the Presbytery to complain of Mr. Hall's opposing the establishment of an intermediate school in Ballyclare. Again, on October 2nd, 1861, a deputation from the Committee and the majority of the Congregation, waited on the Presbytery to complain of Mr. Hall's services on sacramental occasions; and, in the same year, a remonstrance was signed by the Elders and other leading members of the Congregation, and forwarded to Mr. Hall, on the same subject, respectfully requesting him to make some change, and thereby prevent, if possible, a division in the Congregation. An unpleasant feeling was also created against Mr. Hall for his illiberality in allowing the Rev. John Porter to preach in his pulpit for an increase of stipend to himself, and then refusing to allow anyone to preach for the purpose of raising a fund to assist in the education of young men for the ministry.

Mr. Hall says, "I deny that on any occasion a clear majority of *bonâ fide* seatholders, belonging to the old Congregation of Ballyclare, ever voted in opposition to my views and wishes." On December 22nd, 1861, the Congregation was polled for the election of an Elder to attend an approaching meeting of Presbytery; there had previously been, both on the part of Mr. Hall and his opponents, a very active canvass, and the result was, that on the vote being taken, Mr. Hall's nominee, Mr. John Rowan, had only 30, while Mr. Dundee had 66 votes. At the disruption of the Presbytery the stipend book shows 133 names; of these 83 voted for joining the Northern Presbytery, 17 remained neutral, and 33 signed a protest against joining the Northern Presbytery. These numbers clearly show what reliance can be placed on any statement from Mr. Hall. He also states, "that if a majority of the Congregation were against him, he would resign." I challenge him to the proof: let him take the list of stipend payers for any year since his ordi-

nation up to the present day, and I can with confidence assert, that a large majority would be found against him; but he has no intention of asking any such vote; it was a mere flourish to hoodwink the English readers of *The Inquirer*.

Dr. Montgomery and the Rev. John Scott Porter have been repeatedly charged with getting up the dinner to Mr. Dundee in Ballyclare. This statement has as little foundation in truth as many of the others made by Mr. Hall and his supporters. The meeting of the Presbytery of Antrim, at which Mr. Dundee was refused to be acknowledged as Elder from Ballyclare, was held in Belfast, on Wednesday, the 6th of November, 1861, and on Thursday morning, the 7th of November, a meeting was held in Ballyclare; an address was prepared, and a deputation appointed to present it on that day to Mr. Dundee, who was then requested to accept a public dinner, to which he consented, and Mr. Baird of the Hotel, was engaged to provide it before any clergyman was either consulted, or invited to attend.

The origin of the unfortunate law proceedings in which the Congregation has been involved, may be traced to a meeting of the Presbytery of Antrim, held in the Rev. John Porter's Meeting-house, on Wednesday, the 2nd April, 1862, at which a resolution was passed, directing Mr. Hall to appoint a new Committee and Office-Bearers of his own party, and to turn out the old Committee and Elders, some of whom had been in office for more than 30 years, and long before Mr. Hall's appointment as minister. To prevent this resolution from being carried into effect, the meeting-house doors were kept closed on the following Sunday, the 6th of April, Mr. Hall being offered a suitable place to preach in until a settlement could be arrived at; and it was further said, that if he would promise not to turn out the old Office-Bearers, as desired by the Presbytery in their resolution, the doors would be opened at once, but Mr. Hall and his followers refused every offer that was made to them for peace. It will be seen, by the above dates, that it was Mr. Hall and his abettors who first adopted violent proceedings.

It was to the old Committee that Mr. Hall applied for funds to repair the Meeting-house and build a Manse, and while they subscribed and collected about £600, all Mr. Hall's present supporters in the Congregation did not subscribe £20; and some time ago, when one of the S3 went into the Session-house, he was dragged out by the neck, and the doors have been since kept locked against him and all those who opposed Mr. Hall's proceedings. The majority of the Congregation are thus deprived access to the library, which was the property of the Congregation, but which Mr. Hall now *swears* is the property of some Association of his party, although we have the original rules in Mr. Hall's own handwriting, declaring the books to be the property of the Congregation. He also *swears* that there are no rules in the Congregation, while in another paragraph he *swears* that his new Committee was appointed according to Rule III., which is one of the printed rules of the Congregation, and is posted up in the Session-house. Copies of the rules were also distributed among the mem-

bers. Indeed he stated from the pulpit, that he would just take what rules fitted him and reject what did not, and this resolve he has carried out to the letter.

As soon as Mr. Hall's new Committee got possession, they commenced cutting down and carrying off some valuable timber that was planted by the forefathers of those now turned out. They have also disturbed the graves in the burying-ground. One of Mr. Hall's party desiring to have a wall built round a daughter's grave, extended the enclosure unnecessarily several feet into the ground of other parties, cutting through a coffin and corpse, throwing out the bones and leaving them exposed for weeks, until public condemnation of such a wanton act caused them to be re-buried.

A great deal has been said about the sympathy which Mr. Hall receives in Ballyclare and neighbourhood. We are informed that an address was presented to him, having 300 names attached to it, but without saying how they were procured. A day-labourer, who is a Roman Catholic, was employed to hawk about the address, and after haranguing the Congregation at Chapel on Sunday, after mass, procured the names of some parties, who therein certified that "the Rev. John Hall discharged the duties of his office faithfully and efficiently as a Christian minister."

One Calvinistic minister, who is reputed liberal in his views, having heard that Mr. Hall was recommending the writings of Theodore Parker, and thereby giving offence, called on him then for the *first time*, and advised him to keep up his opposition, though against the majority of his Congregation. This worthy sympathizer then waited on some of Mr. Hall's hearers and urged them to leave, and take seats with him, as it was evident, under Mr. Hall's ministry, Unitarianism would soon die out in this neighbourhood. We may thus perceive a motive for sympathy and an endeavour to destroy the Unitarian Congregation; and, indeed, from present appearances, the effort is likely to be successful. Mr. Hall has repeatedly refused to take any stipend from the majority of the Congregation, thereby denying them their right of membership, and causing them to forfeit their property value for £2000.

On the return of Mr. Hall from Dublin, on Saturday night after the trial, his friends in Ballyclare commenced to burn tar-barrels, but failed in obtaining any countenance from the inhabitants, though they continued yelling through the streets up till 3 o'clock on Sunday morning.—I am, yours, &c.,

BALLYCLARE, 16th June, 1863.

ONE OF THE MAJORITY.

INTELLIGENCE.

BRITISH AND FOREIGN UNITARIAN ASSOCIATION.

THE thirty-eighth anniversary of this Society was held at Unity Church, Islington, on May 27th. This new and beautiful building was crowded in every part. The Rev. James Drummond, of Manchester, conducted the devotional services; and the Rev. R. L.

Carpenter preached from John xvii. 3, 21. The business-meeting was then held—Edmund Potter, Esq., M.P., in the chair. The Secretary (Rev. R. B. Aspland) read the annual report, which was a very interesting document. In reference to the foreign department, it was stated that the difficulties in respect to operations in India were so great that the Committee could not hold out expectations of great or enduring results. Mr. William Roberts, the Missionary at Madras, has been still aided from the Indian Fund. It was hoped that the road might soon open for an English Unitarian Missionary in India. In Italy there are friends of liberal Christianity, of cultivation and influence, who are watching the signs of the times, and are ready at the fitting season to aid in Unitarian action. From the Churches in Australia satisfactory reports are received. Those at Adelaide and Sydney, under the able care of the Revs. J. C. Woods and G. H. Stanley, appear to make the chief progress. A second Unitarian Church has been formed at Sydney, and application has been made for a minister from this country. J. E. Clennell, Esq., read the Treasurer's Report.

Resolutions in reference to the Missionary plans and operations of the Association, the Transylvanian brethren, the condition of the poor congregations in the districts of England, the completion of the Revised Translation of the Old Testament, and other subjects, were unanimously adopted.

LONDON SUNDAY-SCHOOL SOCIETY.

The Annual Meeting of this valuable Society was held on Wednesday morning, May 27, the Rev. Thomas Hincks, of Leeds, presiding. The attendance was large, and the proceedings earnest and encouraging. The Chairman addressed the meeting at some length on the importance of the Sunday-School work, and the difficulties connected with it. Mr. Wade, the Secretary, then read the Annual Report, which, with that of the Manchester Association, passed at the meeting of April 3, we hope to notice particularly next month.

THE BALLYCLARE CONGREGATION.

The Attorney General v. the Rev. John Hall, and others.

This important case came on for hearing before the Master of the Rolls, on May 23rd, and occupied the court for six days. The Relators were Messrs. James Alexander, James Gregg, James Laird, George Ledlie, George Warnock, Alexander Galt, James Curry, Samuel Templeton, and William Grange—who sought for an injunction against the Rev. John Hall, William Adamson, James Logan, James H. Johnston, Joseph Miskimmon, John Miskimmon, Hugh Gilmore, Thomas Logan, William Logan, William Henley, William Craig Forsythe, Alexander Gillespie, and Andrew Hetherington.

Mr. BREWSTER, Q.C., who appeared on behalf of the relators, opened their case in an able statement, which occupied the whole of the first day and a considerable part of the second. The daily papers contained a mere outline of the arguments on each

side, and even of this scanty report we have not space to give more than a small portion. In reference to the right of a congregation to leave a Presbytery Mr. Brewster said—A question of primary importance in the case was, whether or not a congregation once united to any Presbytery did not remain united thereto for all time, or whether it had the power of disconnecting itself with the Presbytery to which it had been attached, by a majority of the congregation. There might be a question as to whether a majority should be a simple one or one composed of two-thirds; but he (counsel) held that a majority of the congregation had a right to disconnect itself with the Presbytery, and to join another. Further, supposing that they had no right, *ex mero motu*, to separate themselves from one Presbytery and to join another, the relators contended that they had a right, whenever a Presbytery to which they had attached themselves had so far departed from its original constitution as to make any important difference in its principles, upon the faith of which a congregation had become attached to it, in that case to disconnect themselves with the Presbytery and to join another if they thought fit. If they had no such right the consequence would be most extraordinary, for it would then be in the power of a Presbytery to depart in any manner from its original principles, and the congregations attached to it would have no power to disconnect themselves with it. Counsel contended, therefore, that the Congregation of Ballyclare, in disconnecting itself with the Presbytery, in consequence of that body agreeing to ordain a clergyman for the York Street Congregation, without requiring of him any guarantee of his faith, was perfectly justifiable. The respondents, on the other hand, insisted on a different view of the law. Mr. Hall's case was that the majority of the Congregation had a right to disconnect it from the Presbytery only when the Church was vacant. His information stated that, when a minister is ordained, he is not to be asked any question whatever, nor is he to make any statement as to his faith or his doctrine; but he is to preach a couple of times before his congregation; let them form an opinion of his doctrine, and then go before the Presbytery to be ordained, they not being allowed to ask him any question. And then he could return to the congregation and be, as it was termed, planted. The only question which the Presbytery was entitled to ask him was—"Do you adhere to your call?" and to the congregation—"Do you adhere to your call?" and if both these questions are answered in the affirmative the ordination follows, as a matter of course, irrespective of any doctrines Mr. Hall might hold. Further, Mr. Hall contended that a minister, after he is once ordained and sent to a congregation, must continue the minister of that congregation, unless he is guilty of some moral crime. A mere departure from sound doctrine would not do. It must be a moral turpitude, and if Mr. Hall were to preach the doctrine of the real presence, he would still be entitled to continue the minister of that body of Dissenting Protestants for the full term of his natural life. Such was the law as contended for by Mr. Hall, and a most extraordinary law it was, for it amounted to this—that a minister of a Presbyterian congregation may preach the doctrine of the real presence, of the invocation of saints, or

any other doctrine which Protestant Dissenters hold in most abhorrence, and yet his congregation would be bound to him as long as he lived, and would have no right to depose him from his office.

Mr. FITZGIBBON proceeded to hand in the proofs on the part of the relators.

The SOLICITOR-GENERAL stated the case on the part of the respondents, the Rev. John Hall and others, in the relation suit. He said he hoped to be able to show that the Court should not decide in favour of the relators, or take upon it to say who were the properly-constituted officers of the Congregation of Ballyclare; who were entitled to act as the Committee of the Congregation; or to decide upon points of doctrine or discipline. The relators have separated themselves from the Presbytery of Antrim and joined another; they have called upon the Rev. Mr. Hall to follow them in this course, but he declined to do so, and they now sought to obtain an injunction order from the Court, declaring that he must attend the meetings of the Northern Presbytery of Antrim, according to the decision of what they call the majority of the Congregation. If the relators were not satisfied with the conduct of the Rev. Mr. Hall, they would have shown more sense by devoting a small portion of the money that will be spent in this suit in building another meeting-house, and getting a minister who would agree with them in being connected with the Northern Presbytery of Antrim. That would add to the architectural beauty of Ballyclare, and provide a meeting-house for themselves. But, instead of adopting that course, they come here and ask the Court to declare that the Presbytery of Antrim had departed from its original constitution, and that the Rev. Mr. Hall should join them in leaving it and going over to another. If the Court acceded to that proposition, it would affect the *status* of every congregation connected with it, and declare them out of the Church altogether, and incapable of holding any of the property now belonging to them. He was certain that the Court would not do anything so monstrous as that. In 1726 the Presbytery of Antrim separated from the Synod of Ulster—had not since then varied in its practice or principles—never put testing questions to ministers presenting themselves for ordination, but leaving all to draw their creed from the Bible, which they accepted as the sole rule of faith and practice. It was insisted, on the other side, that it was the right of a congregation to separate from any Presbytery and join itself to another, without the assent of its minister; but he defied them to show any authority for that proposition, or to point out a single instance where such a thing had been done. It was admitted that no such case could be cited. The second proposition contended for on the other side was, that if a Presbytery departed from the original principles on which it had been founded, any congregation is justified in withdrawing from that Presbytery and attaching itself to another, and taking its minister and property with it. He contended that the other side could not show that the Presbytery of Antrim had violated its original constitution, or in any way departed from the practice and principles laid down in 1726. The ordinary rule has been to ask the congregation do they

adhere to their call, and to ask the minister the same question. It is said—No matter what the usage has been, we have the six propositions for peace, and it is a violation of them not to put these questions. There is a great deal of controversy in the case whether these six propositions have formed any part of the principles of the Presbytery of Antrim. We say they do not. They were proposed and rejected, and fell to the ground.

Mr. ANDREWS then proceeded to read and hand in the proofs on the part of the respondents.

Mr. F. WALSHE, Q.C., next addressed the Court on the part of the relators, and concluded his argument by citing several cases to show that the Court had full jurisdiction to give the relief sought by them; that the Congregation of Ballyclare, acting by the majority, were entitled, on good and sufficient cause, to separate from the Presbytery of Antrim and join the Northern Presbytery of Antrim, even without the assent of their minister; and that they were fully justified in doing so in consequence of the Presbytery of Antrim having departed from the original constitution and principles on which it was founded after the separation from the Synod of Ulster in 1726.

Mr. ANDREWS having followed for the respondents, and Mr. FITZGIBBON for the relators, Sergeant SULLIVAN replied on behalf of the respondents. He denied the right of the Congregation, or any portion of it, to separate from the Presbytery of Antrim and join another without the assent of the minister, or in despite of him; and, especially, they could not do so, if at all, on the grounds alleged. It was said that the Presbytery of Antrim had departed from its original constitution and principles; but the fact was that it was the relators who had abandoned the old path, and wanted to compel their minister to go over with them to the Northern Presbytery of Antrim, which had, in reality, departed from the principle of non-subscription. On all the grounds stated, he submitted that the Court should dismiss the informations.

THE MASTER OF THE ROLLS said that it was not his intention to dispose of the case at present, though there were some parts of it on which he had no doubt. In one portion of this case which had been previously before him—the case of the Rev. Mr. Hall against Galt—a most outrageous proceeding took place. The present relators took upon themselves to shut the Rev. Mr. Hall out of the meeting-house of Ballyclare, in which he had officiated for several years as their minister. Such a proceeding was the more to be condemned when perpetrated by respectable men. In no part of the informations as framed, and dexterously framed, for the purpose of endeavouring to exclude Mr. Hall from the Church of which he has been minister, was there a single instance given of a congregation ever having removed their minister? What was the nature of the questions proposed to be decided? The first proposition was, “That in the Presbyterian Church generally, and in the Presbytery of Antrim particularly, a congregation had the right and power, of its own will and pleasure, to withdraw from and sever all connexion with the ecclesiastical body with which it was united, and join another;” and then it asks that “the Ballyclare

Congregation may be declared to have, by the votes of a majority, the right so to sever their connexion with the Presbytery of Antrim." Now, it was meant to establish this proposition independent of any evidence in support of it. On the sworn informations of clergymen on the part of the relators, it was said that a congregation had the right to so withdraw. These gentlemen swore these informations without the slightest inquiry into the facts, in order to satisfy themselves that a congregation had ever done what they swore they had a right to do. Upon this question he was bound to decide against the proposition of the relators. The next question was that of the trust in the church property. For what was that church property set apart? In the year 1726, the Congregation of Ballyclare was one of those which seceded from the Synod of Ulster on the question of Non-Subscription, and the Six Propositions which have been referred to, were adopted as the principles of the Presbytery of Antrim. The relators said that they had adopted those Propositions; but, on inquiry, it was found that they had cut away a great part of one of them, and added Mr. M'Alester's resolution, which required the candidate to answer certain questions on fundamental points of doctrine. The real case had been clearly put on the other side by Mr. Andrews, and he confessed he did not understand the case clearly until he heard Mr. Andrews' clear and able statement. He believed that the relators and the Northern Presbytery of Antrim were the real seceders; but, as this was a matter of great importance, he would read over the whole of the evidence, which would take him about two months, and would give a written decision on it.

NORTHERN SUNDAY-SCHOOL ASSOCIATION.

The Annual Meeting of this Association was held in the Second Meeting-house, Belfast, on Monday evening, June 8,—the Rev. Henry Alexander in the chair. After the meeting had been opened with prayer, the Chairman introduced the proceedings by some remarks on the value of Sunday-Schools, and expressed his surprise and gratitude that, although the time allotted weekly to Sunday-School work was so short, so much good was accomplished. He then called on the Secretary, the Rev. C. J. M'Alester, to read the Report for the past year. Among the matters noticed in it were the publication of some new tracts, written by the Rev. T. Bowring, and a small work on Natural Theology by the same gentleman, which had been carefully revised, and was now in the press. It also referred to the unsatisfactory returns from some schools, and the want of any return from others, and urged the importance of systematic management in every Sunday-School. The adoption of the Report was moved by the Rev. John Porter, and seconded by the Rev. John Berryhill. The Rev. T. Bowring moved, and Mr. Robert M'Calmont seconded, a resolution on the importance of the Sunday-School, and the duty of labouring to sustain it and to promote its efficiency. The Rev. John Jellie moved a resolution expressing the sympathy of the Association with the London Sunday-School Society and the Manchester Dis-

trict Sunday-School Association, and reciprocating the friendly sentiments uniformly manifested by them to this Association. Mr. W. H. Greer seconded this resolution. The Rev. John Scott Porter moved, and the Rev. Robert Cleland seconded, a vote of thanks to the Hibernian Bible Society, for their liberality in granting copies of the Scriptures at reduced prices. A Committee for the ensuing year was then appointed, on the motion of Mr. William Spackman.

At the close of the proceedings, Mr. Jellie, as Secretary of the Sunday-School Teachers' Union, read the Report of that Society, which mentioned the several meetings held in the course of the year, and the subject of lecture at each of them; it concluded with an appeal to the young to sustain the Society by attending its meetings and interesting themselves in the various subjects discussed: they would thus be more deeply impressed with the importance of the Sunday-School work, and enabled more efficiently to take part in it. On the motion of the Rev. John Porter, seconded by the Rev. J. Scott Porter, this Report was adopted, and will be printed with that of the Sunday-School Association. A Committee for the next year was then appointed, and the meeting was closed with prayer.

OBITUARY.

Died, at the residence of her son, 205, Great Brunswick Street, Dublin, on May 24, Eliza, Widow of Hugh Kidd, Esq., of Newry, and formerly of Armagh, aged 76.

Died, at his residence, Drumbo, on June 6, Dr. Munce, aged 72.

Died, at Sydney, on April 21, Mr. Samuel S. Connor, son of Dr. Connor, Newry.

Died, at Richmond Lodge, County Down, on June 24, Sara, daughter of the late John Dunville, Esq.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

ERRATUM.—In "The Ballyclare Case," page 196, 18th line from top, for "member" read "minister"; and page 199, 10th line from bottom, for "April" read "February."

We have received a letter from Mr. James Andrews referring to Dr. Montgomery's communication in our last number on the Carrickfergus case, and begging his friends to suspend their judgment on the points raised by the Doctor. It is enough thus to make known Mr. Andrews' request: the publication of his letter would only inflict on our readers more controversy of a personal nature, of which we have already had too much.

Communications for the Editor, to be addressed by post to Rev. C. J. M'Alister, Holywood; or, otherwise, to 45, Arthur Street, Belfast.

Orders for the work and business communications to be sent to the Agent of the Unitarian Society, 45, Arthur Street.

THE
CHRISTIAN UNITARIAN.

VOL. II.]

AUGUST, 1863.

[No. 7.]

THE SCRIPTURES OUR RULE OF FAITH AND DUTY.

THAT was a noble stand which the early Reformers took in battling with the Church—"The Scriptures our only rule of faith and duty." Maintaining this simple but glorious principle, they waged a successful war against the advocates of human authority and ecclesiastical domination, and emancipated a considerable portion of Christendom from the bondage of Rome. But, while the Reformers of the sixteenth century, in their controversies with the Church, consistently contended for the sole and supreme authority of Scripture, they appear to have misapprehended the liberty for which they so ably fought; and hence we find them placing above the Scripture their own interpretation of its teachings, and denying the privileges of the Church, and even the name of Christian, to those who did not embrace their own doctrinal views. Thus Luther strenuously endeavoured to deprive of every Christian right and every worldly blessing, the man who did not believe in the real presence of Christ in the eucharist; and Calvin persecuted Servetus, and had him burned at the stake, for denying the doctrine of Three Persons in One Godhead. Two centuries later the same standard which Luther and his companions had borne in their struggles against the oppressive rule of the Romish Church, was unfurled in Ulster by those venerable men who resisted the authority of the Westminster Confession; and the watchword of Haliday and Nevin, Abernethy, Bruce, and others, in their contest with the advocates of human authority, was—"the Scriptures our sole rule of faith." One is naturally led to inquire, why those writings, which are

known in all churches as the Sacred Scriptures, were thus raised above the decrees of ancient councils, and the creeds and the confessions of later times. What element do they possess, which did not belong to these human compositions? The answer is obvious; they believed them to contain a divine revelation—and it is this belief, consistently held by the earliest and the latest reformers, which led them to vindicate their authority, and disentangle them, as far as they could, from the numerous interpretations with which they had been overlaid and obscured. Respecting the extent of divine teaching embodied in the Scriptures, there is among the most earnest Christians a great diversity of opinion; and even during the last five and twenty years, the views of every Protestant Church must have been greatly modified. Few now would be found to argue that God approved of all the deeds of cruelty and murder which in the Old Testament Scripture he is represented as directing or sanctioning; but that there is a divine revelation in the Old Testament, and that it is fully developed in the New, will be found to be the opinion universally entertained by those who, discarding human authority in religion, sincerely take the Scriptures as their rule of faith. That there are human elements in the Bible, all intelligent men will admit; and to separate the human from the the divine, the earth from the gold, is the legitimate business of the Biblical critic; but to maintain the sufficiency of the Scriptures, and to reject human authority in matters of religion, is of necessity to place the Scriptures above human authority. To profess allegiance to the Lord Jesus Christ, and to refuse submission to the authority of fallible men, is to raise our Saviour above the errors of humanity, and to regard him as an infallible teacher. This was the strong conviction of those who founded their Church on the Scriptures; and, of necessity, those who profess to make the Scriptures their rule of faith and duty, and yet do not believe that they contain a divine revelation, are either inconsistent or dishonest. They are inconsistent, if they regard them as ordinary human compositions, and yet, rejecting human authority, make them their rule of faith; and dishonest, if, while they attach no authority to them, they lead

the multitude to believe that they make them the guide of their religious principles.

In taking the Scriptures as a rule of faith, it cannot be understood that every sentence which they contain is to be a rule binding on our conscience: for we know that they contain the most conflicting sentiments; and if we embrace some, we ought to reject others. In the Psalms of David there are expressions that directly clash with the plainest teaching of our Saviour. Thus the Psalmist says, "Do not I hate them, O Lord, that hate thee? . . . I hate them with perfect hatred." We have in the Old Testament the record of most cruel and treacherous acts, performed apparently with the sanction of God, from which our natural affections recoil, and which the spirit of Christ's Gospel most distinctly condemns. Such sentiments and deeds are surely to be the rule neither of faith nor of duty to the Christian. The plainest teachings of modern science forbid us to adopt as truth the cosmogony which the book of Genesis contains. The unanimous consent of Christians of all denominations rebels against the observance of a Jewish Sabbath, though some Protestant sects in later times give to the first day of the week something of the character which the law of Moses gave to the seventh. Enlightened opinion in modern times, formed under the influence of Christ's spirit, condemns the holding of our fellow-men in bondage; but the selfishness of some would justify so cruel a practice, and would find an authority for it in the book of Leviticus. It is evident that if every part of the Old Testament is, in itself, to be our rule, we shall often be led to violate the Gospel of Christ; and, perhaps, to the indiscriminating reverence and blind authority which past ages have given to the Old Testament, may be traced the bitter and vindictive spirit, the cruel persecutions, the ruthless and exterminating wars, the bloody enactments, the slavery and superstition that have often characterized and disgraced Christian nations: and to the same source may be traced, also, the unmeaning rites and ceremonies that have obscured the simplicity of Christian worship. When we take the Scriptures as our rule, it is those Scriptures as interpreted by Christ, and as they embody his life and spirit: and if now we were

seeking a watchword, by which we could resist superstition on the one hand, and unbelief on the other, and by which we would vindicate the authority of divine revelation, it should be not the *Scriptures*, but the *Gospel*, "our rule of faith and duty." It is true, however, that the principle, as understood by our Non-Subscribing forefathers, is the same, whichever phrase we employ; for all would be ready to admit that the Old Testament teachings are binding only in so far as they are in harmony with the mind and the spirit of Christ.

Till very recently, the acceptance of the Scriptures as our rule of faith and duty would have been regarded as an acknowledgment of their divine authority, especially on the part of those who refuse to submit to the dictation of fallible men. But now we find those who seek to drag down the Scriptures from the high position which our reforming ancestors gave them, and to reduce them to mere human compositions, adopting as their motto, "The Scriptures our only rule of faith," and, under the cover of that sacred principle, opening the Church to the rankest unbelief. Men notorious for their rejection of everything divine in revelation,—men who believe little more about the Bible, (to employ the language of one of themselves,) than *that there is such a book*,—are loudest in the cry of "The Scriptures our only rule of faith." They are like enemies who have surreptitiously possessed themselves of the uniform, and fraudulently learned the password of the garrison, and thus by treachery gained an entrance into the citadel. Interrogate some of these "foremost thinkers" respecting the meaning which they attach to the word *Scriptures*, or *Gospel*, and you will probably find that they will compress all into the two precepts of loving God and loving our neighbour, and will regard the divine mission of our Lord, his miracles and his resurrection, as nothing more than old legends with which, as one of their learned sympathizers lately said, "the world has been *too long humbugged*." It is melancholy to find men thus using language, not to express, but to conceal their opinions. How, in any honest sense, can they profess to make the Scriptures their rule, while the tendency of all they teach is to set at nought their doctrines and subvert their authority? They express great admiration for

Theodore Parker. In their periodicals they recommend his prayers and eulogize his theology. We sincerely wish they were in one point his disciples. He was honest in all he said; bitter at times, but ever manly and outspoken. He never concealed his opinions behind vague platitudes, or by common-place phrases endeavoured to throw dust in his neighbours' eyes. He never would have cried—"The Scriptures our only rule of faith," while he placed no more authority in them than in the writings of Marcus Antoninus, the heathen moralist. With as much reason and with as much honesty as some accept the Scriptures, they could accept the Koran, or the Book of Mormon as their rule of faith and duty. The phrase, as men now employ it, may signify much or little, everything or nothing. It is used by Christian and Deist alike. It is needful that it should receive some explanation. None take every sentence, or even every book, of the Scriptures as their rule; and some, by the Scriptures, seem in their own mind to understand only one or two of its moral precepts. It is time that the Protestant Churches which accept the Scriptures as "their rule of faith and duty" should tell the world what they mean by the Scriptures.

CONGREGATIONAL MEMOIRS.

BALLYCARRY (OR BROADISLAND) CONGREGATION.

(Concluded from p. 194.)

IN 1829 took place the secession of the Remonstrants from the General Synod of Ulster, and the consequent formation of the Remonstrant Synod. Mr. Glendy, who was then minister of Ballycarry, was, as is well known, a Remonstrant, and took his proper part in the ecclesiastical proceedings of that stirring period. These proceedings are detailed in the newspapers and religious periodicals of the day, and need not here be recited further than as they bear upon the congregational history of Ballycarry. The meeting of the Templepatrick Presbytery, at which the secession of the Remonstrant members took place, was held at Ballynure, Nov. 3, 1829, and was attended

by, I believe, all the ministers—thirteen in number—who were then members of that Body, including Mr. Glendy, who was Moderator, and who was accompanied by John Boyle as Elder. The five senior ministers of the Presbytery, viz., THOMAS ALEXANDER (*Cairncastle*), ROBERT CAMPBELL (*Templepatrick*), NATHANIEL ALEXANDER (*Crumlin*), ALEXANDER MONTGOMERY (*Glenarm*), and WILLIAM GLENDY (*Ballycarry*), being asked if they adhered to their declared intention of separating themselves from the General Synod of Ulster, and having answered in the affirmative, were heard at great length as to the reasons which induced them to take this step. It was then moved and agreed to “that the Presbytery could not receive this declaration of their brethren without the most painful emotions and the deepest regret;” after which the five ministers retired, and subsequently formed themselves into a new Presbytery called “The Remonstrant Presbytery of Templepatrick,” which held its inaugural meeting in Cairncastle on the 8th day of next December. Mr. Glendy’s speech, on occasion of parting from his former co-presbyters, is reported at considerable length in *The Northern Whig* of November 5, 1829. When delivered it must have been very effective, and even at this distance of time it is difficult to read some portions of it without emotion. The following passages are here given because they refer to his connexion with the Congregation of Broadisland:—

“In stating the grounds of my present determination (to secede), it is necessary for me to contrast the Synod in its present condition with what it was seventeen years ago, when I became a member of it. When I was licensed, I was called upon for no subscription. When I was ordained, no subscription was deemed necessary. I do recollect that I was about to be asked to a different Congregation from that in which I am placed, but which was under the care of a Presbytery that required subscription. I consulted Mr. Cooke on the subject, and told him I was determined not to subscribe. He replied that he thought I was right, and advised me not to accept of the invitation. At my period of life it is no easy matter to give up the attachment of a people among whom I have lived so long, whom I have loved, and by whom I have been loved in return; for I believe no minister and his people were ever more strongly attached to each other. But in coming to my present determination, I have resolved to leave all earthly considerations out of sight. In the course which I have pursued I have never consulted my Congregation. I have never asked them to leave the

Synod. I have given notice that on next Sunday I will take their determination on the subject. They shall act with perfect freedom. If they are determined to separate with me, I shall rejoice; but if they are determined to remain with the Synod, I must separate myself from them."

Of the continued attachment to him, on this occasion, of the great body of the people, Mr. Glendy cannot have had much doubt, at least if we are to judge from what took place at Ballycarry a few days afterwards, on Tuesday, December 15, 1829. On that day the orthodox Presbytery of Templepatrick rashly attempted to hold a meeting within the bounds of Mr. Glendy's Congregation, and even within the walls of his meeting-house, after he had renounced their jurisdiction. That was indeed a great day for Ballycarry. Two different accounts of the proceedings may be found in the newspapers of the period—one in *The Belfast Guardian* of December 18,* and the other in *The Northern Whig* of December 21, 1829. Both narratives agree in stating that the Orthodox ministers asked admission into Mr. Glendy's meeting-house, and were refused; that they then proceeded towards the churchyard for the purpose of holding their Presbytery; that even there they found the gates closed against them, and were rudely denied admission by a multitude of upwards of one thousand people; that they attempted to hold their meeting outside of the churchyard gates; that the Moderator (Rev. W. J. M'Kay, of Ballynure) commenced by singing a psalm, but his voice was effectually drowned by the discordant yells of his congregation; that the intruders were hissed, hooted, and almost pelted; and that finally, amid triumphant cheers from their oppo-

* "A correspondent," says *The Guardian*, "mentions a singular circumstance, which we had not an opportunity of observing—that a stone stands in the wall of the Ballycarry Meeting-house, probably since its erection, bearing the following inscription, 'To end 1829.'" The correspondent was quite correct. A stone with such an inscription is still, I believe, over one of the doors of the Ballycarry Meeting-house, although it has been purposely covered over with rough-cast. A similar stone was also at one time over another door of the building, but it was removed in consequence of some repairs, and is now under the pulpit, where I have seen it. The inscription, in very large letters, is—"1710, to end in 1829." But this evidently alludes, not to the ending of the Congregation, but to the ending of the lease of the meeting-house, which did actually expire in 1829. The house and adjacent property are now held from year to year at a nominal rent.

nents, and shouts of "No surrender," they were obliged to take shelter in a public house, where they transacted the business of their meeting. In the evening Dr. Cooke, who was also present in the body, was burned in effigy. It was indeed a great day for Ballycarry.

During the trying times which followed, Mr. Glendy was able not only to maintain his ground in his own Congregation, but to render effectual assistance to other ministers of kindred sentiments, who were, in many respects, less favourably situated than himself. He was the life and soul of the Remonstrant Presbytery of Templepatrick, and few of the neighbouring Remonstrant ministers or Congregations would have survived the ordeal through which they were called to pass, had it not been for the ready wit, the effective eloquence, and the untiring energy of William Glendy, minister of Ballycarry. He was the founder of the Remonstrant Congregation of Carrickfergus, which was organized in 1833, and "planted" with a minister in 1835. Having been much mortified by the treatment, ungrateful as he considered it, which he received from Dr. Reid, who was then minister of Carrickfergus, and whose settlement in that Congregation he had, in former times, effectually promoted, Mr. Glendy allowed his resentment, which was not unnatural, to suggest retaliation upon an unfaithful friend. Hence, perhaps, one motive of his exertions to establish a hostile settlement within the Doctor's bounds. But I fear that this feeling sometimes caused Mr. Glendy to be not sufficiently cautious as to the means which he employed to effect his purpose. I fear that in building up a professedly Christian Church he was tempted occasionally to make use of materials whose unfitness for the contemplated work must even then have been secretly felt by himself, and has since been made painfully manifest to all men. In the house which he erected there is now a "split," for its foundations were insufficient. The ship which he launched has gone to pieces, for some of its original timbers were rotten. In 1838 Mr. Glendy heartily co-operated in the establishment of a Remonstrant Congregation at Raloo, for which, it may be hoped, a happier fate is reserved than has attended the kindred erection in Carrickfergus.

In 1843 and 1844 Mr. Glendy took an active part in the proceedings which terminated in the passing of the Dissenters' Chapels Bill. He was a member of the Deputation from the Irish Non-Subscribing Churches which proceeded to London on this business; and on his return to his ministerial charge, he received, on the 29th August, 1844, at the hands of a very numerous and highly respectable assemblage in his own meeting-house, a cordial and most hearty welcome back to his own loved and loving Ballycarry.

Little more remains to be told of Mr. Glendy's ministry. In 1852 he asked and obtained leave of his Synod to take an assistant and successor in the discharge of the duties of his office. Shortly afterwards, being afflicted with an acute disease, he removed to Belfast, where he died on the 24th of July, 1853, in the 71st year of his age, and the 41st of his ministry. His remains were laid beside those of his wife in his own meeting-house green, where a modest tablet, decently enclosed with an iron railing, tells the names of those who sleep below. They never had any family; so that from the neighbourhood of Ballycarry the *name* of Glendy has already passed away; but I am sure the *memory* of Glendy will long be fondly cherished in the district of Broadisland, for never was minister more devotedly attached to his people than was Mr. Glendy to his. Indeed his fault, perhaps, was that he loved them, and sometimes told them his love, "not wisely, but *too* well."

After the death of Mr. Glendy, we reach "the land of living men," with respect to whom our record must, of course, be very brief.

VI.—The sixth minister of Ballycarry was THOMAS O'GORMAN, Mr. Glendy's assistant, who was ordained on September 29, 1852, and who resigned charge of the Congregation in April, 1854.

VII.—The seventh minister was MOORE GETTY, who was ordained December 27, 1854, and is now the worthy minister of Ballycarry.

My main object in compiling these Congregational Memoirs being to save from destruction the perishable records of the past, I do not add here any description of the present condition of the Ballycarry Congregation, although I have every reason to believe that it is, in most respects, such as its friends could wish. But I cannot avoid expressing my regret that I have not been able to trace out a single congregational record of any importance connected with the history of the oldest Presbyterian Congregation in Ireland. That such records were once kept, I must believe, for we have an acknowledgment of their existence so late as the Visitation of Ballycarry in 1828. But what has since become of them I cannot, after anxious inquiries in various quarters, ascertain. I fear they have shared the fate of most such records, and, having come to be considered in the light of private property, have gone the way of waste paper. I am, however, bound to acknowledge that in this lamented absence of records I have, while preparing the foregoing narrative, received the most ready and courteous assistance, whenever I required it, from my friend and neighbour Mr. Getty.

With a few words on the congregational property of Ballycarry, I shall conclude this Memoir, which is already too long. The meeting-house and surrounding green are, as already stated, held from year to year, at a small rent, under the proprietor of the Broadisland estate. A house and farm of about thirty acres have for many years been occupied, under the same proprietor, by several successive ministers of Ballycarry. At one time this property was vested in trustees, for the benefit of the minister for the time being, and was subject to a very moderate rent; but the lease, like that of the meeting-house, expired in 1829, and it can scarcely now be said that "the minister's house and farm" are congregational property. In fact no one seems to have a definite interest in them except the landlord, the consequence of which has naturally been that the house, for many years, has been in bad repair. I have latterly heard some talk about a manse (properly so-called), but I believe nothing has yet been done.

The "Silver Christening Bason" presented, as already

stated, by Mr. Edmonstone "for the use of the meeting-house in the Parish of Broadisland," is now in the hands of the Congregation which seceded from Mr. Glendy's ministry at the time of the Remonstrant separation, and whose first and present pastor is the Rev. John Stuart. In the same hands are also the *old* Communion Cups of Broadisland; and the following particulars respecting these ecclesiastical articles have been kindly furnished to me by Mr. Stuart. On the rim of the Christening Bason is the inscription—"The Gift of Archibald Edmonstone, Esq., of this Christening Bason to the Presbyterian Congregation of Broadisland." On the bottom are the Edmonstone arms, with the motto—" *Virtus auget honorem.*" On the one side of the Communion Cups are the words—"The Gift of Captain Edward Brice;" on the other side are the Brice arms, with the motto—"Do well; doubt not." On none of the articles is there any date.

To replace the *old* Communion Cups, the present Mr. Dalway, of Bellahill (under whose forefathers the occupants of Red Hall and Castle Dobbs held as tenants), presented the Old Congregation with a new set of silver Communion Cups, bearing the following inscription—"The Gift of Marriott Dalway, Esq., of Bellahill, to the Old Presbyterian Congregation of Broadisland, in connexion with the Remonstrant Synod of Ulster, 1832."

The only other piece of ecclesiastical property which I ever heard of, in connexion with the Broadisland Congregation, is an old and very venerable hand-bell, somewhat resembling St. Patrick's bell in size and shape, though not in age. It was formerly rung through the village on Sundays to bring the people back to the afternoon sermon; and I have often admired the judicious economy of labour with which the sexton on those occasions used to ring it opposite to the doors of the two public houses in Ballycarry, and of those houses alone. He knew his men well, and he knew where they were to be found when wanted. This venerable bell is now part of the furniture of a National School. "To such vile uses may we come at last."

CLASSON PORTER.

LARNE, June 12, 1863.

ALL'S WELL.

SWEET-VOICED Hope! thy fine discourse
Foretold not half life's good to me;
Thy painter, Fancy, hath not force
To shew how sweet it is to be.

Thy witching dream,
And pictured scheme,
To match the fact still want the power;
Thy promise brave,
From birth to grave,
Life's boon may beggar in an hour.

"Ask and receive," 'tis sweetly said,
But what to ask for know I not,
For wish is worsted, hope o'ersped,
And aye to thanks returns my thought.

If I would pray,
I've nought to say
But this, that God may be God still.
For Him to live
Is still to give,
And sweeter than my wish His will.

O wealth of Life beyond all bound,
Eternity each moment given!
What plummet may the *present* sound?
Who promises a future heaven?
Or glad, or grieved,
Oppressed, relieved,
In blackest night or darkest day,
Still pours the flood
Of golden good,
And more than heart-full fills me aye.

My wealth is common—I possess
No petty province, but the whole.
What's mine alone is mine far less
Than treasure shared by every soul.
Talk not of store,
Millions or more,
Of values which the purse may hold;

But this divine,
I own the mine
Whose gems outweigh a planet's gold.

I have a stake in every star,
In every beam that fills the day ;
All hearts of men my coffers are ;
My ores arterial tides convey.
The fields, the skies,
And sweet replies
Of thought to thought are my gold dust ;
The oaks, the brooks,
And speaking looks
Of lover's faith and friendship's trust.

Life's youngest tides joy-brimming flow
For him who lives above all years ;
Who all-immortal makes the *now*,
And is not ta'en in time's arrears.

His life's a hymn
The seraphim
Might hark to hear or help to sing ;
And to his soul
The boundless whole
Its bounty all doth daily bring.

"All mine is thine," the sky-soul saith,
"The wealth I am must thou become—
Richer and richer, breath by breath,
Immortal gain, immortal room."

And since all his
Mine also is,
Life's gift outruns my fancies far,
And drowns the dream
In larger stream,
As morning drinks the morning-star.

D. E. WASSON.

THE ORIGIN AND AIM OF SUNDAY SCHOOLS.

SUBSTANCE OF AN ADDRESS TO THE TEACHERS OF THE SUNDAY SCHOOL UNION, BELFAST. BY THE REV. THOMAS BOWRING.

THE Sunday School presents an important and continually widening field for Christian exertion. No sacrifices, no labours, should be considered too great to extend its influence, whilst none more likely to reward, and that abundantly, the faithful endeavour. You, my friends, have been already well addressed on the qualifications and duties of a Sunday School teacher. You have been told of the obligations, the trials, the recompense of the work to which you so earnestly address yourselves, and you need nothing from me to supplement the observations of the judicious and excellent friends who have preceded me in the task now before us. I have, therefore, chosen this evening to speak to you on what may be a novel theme to some present—the origin and aim of Sunday Schools; rather what *was* the origin, what *should* be the aim of these Institutions. The subject is interesting, and in many respects very important. At best I can present only a slight sketch,—still, such as I trust each of you will be enabled to fill up by subsequent labour and experience.

I am well aware that, in general estimation, Sunday Schools date their origin from the efforts of Robert Raikes, of Gloucester, some eighty years since, and, popularly speaking, the general opinion is correct. Yet there was much Sunday teaching before the days of Raikes. So, many had mourned over the slave trade and negro slavery before Clarkson devoted his life to their destruction, or Wilberforce had eloquently declaimed against these foul wrongs in Parliament, and thus caused Fox to abolish the one and Lord Grey to put down the other in all our colonies. Many had visited jails and hospitals, ere Howard drew public attention to their abuses. Many had visited the poor in their dwellings, and ministered to their pressing spiritual and temporal wants, ere Tuckerman founded the Ministry at Large; and many also had compassionated and had aided the little Arabs of the streets, ere what is called “The Ragged

School Movement" had begun. The great merit that belongs to all the excellent persons whose names are now associated with Sunday Schools, with Missions, and kindred benevolent Institutions, is this, that they *systematized* their proceedings, gave them shape, consistency; that they devoted their lives to the several works, called public attention to them, shewed how they might be best carried on, loved not their lives, even unto the death, so that the work of the Lord might prosper. And with regard to the subject immediately before us—Sunday Schools—why, in some form or other, Sunday Schools have for ages been a fact in the history of the Church. The catechumens of old were Sunday scholars, and in all sections of the Church, and in all ages, youth has been instructed in the great truths of the Bible on the Lord's day. It was essentially so with the old English Puritans, as well as those of the sister kingdoms. By them the Sunday was kept with a rigour totally unknown to the present generation. Dr. Priestley, writing of things in his youth, and from his own knowledge, says, "The Lord's day was kept with peculiar strictness; no victuals were dressed on that day in any family; no member of it was permitted to walk out for recreation; but the whole of the day was spent at the public meeting, or at home in reading, meditation, and prayer in the family and in the closet." Of course every large household was then, strictly speaking, a Sunday School. So Mrs. Cappe tells us, in her most interesting memoirs, that her friend, Theophilus Lindsey, who had not then resigned his vicarage, devoted an hour in his parish Church every Sunday, to alternately catechising the children, and expounding the Bible to the boys of large schools kept in the village. "The number of the boys generally amounted to a hundred, who formed a large circle round him, himself holding a Bible open in his hand, with which he walked slowly round, giving it regularly in succession to the boys, each reading in his turn." Mrs. Lindsey had also Sunday evening classes—boys and girls in turn. Here we have real Sunday Schools, and what follows is perhaps yet more to the purpose. "I established," says Mrs. Cappe, "a sort of Sunday School at Bedale, collecting together a number of poor children,

whom I assisted in learning to read, giving them Watt's Shorter Catechism and devotional hymns, and endeavouring to give them such instruction as might enable them to read their Bibles with more intelligence. I had no place to receive them but the back kitchen." Hence, in a small inconvenient room she met them every Sunday, divided them into classes, and was thus occupied, save the time spent at Church, nearly the whole day. My own recollections point to a very delightful period of youth, when I enjoyed the catechetical instructions of a revered friend, who now rests from his labours, awaiting his recompense at the resurrection of the just.

But we must proceed to the history of Sunday Schools proper; and whatever may be said—*has* been said—to the contrary, it is to Robert Raikes that we owe the origin of the Sunday School as it now exists. Raikes was a printer, a thriving tradesman, a shrewd man in worldly matters, still one whose thoughts were not wholly of the earth. He had not the keen spiritual discernment of an Oberlin or a Tuckerman; yet he was possessed of great practical benevolence, and was rationally pious. His life, so far as we know it, was upright, consistent, and spent in the love of God and man. He has been portrayed by some as if a St. Bernard or St. Francis, a Wesley or a Whitefield, as one whose whole thoughts were engrossed by the love of souls and the things of eternity, and who, on behalf of his favourite Sunday Schools, was a kind of spiritual Quixote. All this is simply absurd. He was a plain, good man, with an abundance of what Locke terms sound round-about good sense; but he was in no degree an enthusiast. Perhaps he was none the worse on that account. In Gloucester, and near the close of the last century, there was, as in all other towns, a great number of poor children totally uncared for. How they fared, how educated, was nobody's business. They were truly heathens in a nominally Christian land—savages in the midst of civilization—waifs on the shore—pariahs amongst the more favoured castes. Thus beaten and wounded, robbed of the treasures of heavenly wisdom, they lay by the road-side, whilst the priest and the Levite,—the well-to-do,—passed them carelessly by. Raikes, we are

told, going one day through one of the lowest parts of the town, was horrified by the slang, the oaths, the blasphemies that assailed his ears on all sides. Many of the offenders were mere boys, some scarcely above infancy. He remarked on this to a decent-looking woman who lived on the spot. "Oh, Sir," she replied, "what you now witness is nothing to what you would find here on a Sunday, for then, having no work to do, the place is full of these noisy scamps, so that we have no peace from morning till night." Mr. Raikes says, "the thought at once struck me, can nothing be done for these poor, perishing children?" He was determined to try. He went on the next Sunday, called together a number of the "roughs" assembled as usual, spoke kindly to them, and told them he would himself instruct them on the following Lord's day, if they would promise to meet him. "Come," he said, "just as you are; never mind your clothes, only have clean faces and hands, and your hair combed." Many of these poor lads came in consequence, whilst, in the meantime, their kind friend had made arrangements with the person to whom he had previously spoken, and engaged one of her rooms wherein to meet his new pupils. He tried their abilities, formed them into classes, taught them the rudiments of knowledge, and especially to read and value their Bibles. Mr. Raikes was soon aided, and that effectually, by influential persons in the city, whilst his scholars learned to appreciate his benevolent efforts to rescue them from the dominion of ignorance and vice, and conceived for him the most affectionate veneration. Not one of them, he subsequently remarked, had ever been brought before a magistrate for misconduct, "whilst many of these poor fellows," he narrates with much simplicity, "had taken it into their heads to go to morning prayers in Gloucester Cathedral, before they went to their daily work, going thither in procession, and behaving during the service in the most decorous manner." The fame of Raikes's proceedings quickly spread through the kingdom; towns, congregations, and individuals caught the contagion—using the word in its best possible sense. A great discovery had been made; a new moral world seemed to have been found; men only wondered how they had

missed it. It was Columbus making the egg stand on end by the simplest means, and yet by means unthought of before. The English Dissenters were among the first to perceive and to seize on the advantages Sunday Schools promised, and, in many of their societies, they were at once established. It was in the year 1780, or 1781, that Raikes made his experiment. Fifty years from that time the Sunday School jubilee was held, which must be in the recollection of many of us. At that time (1831) Sunday Schools were scattered, broadcast as it were, over the land,—through England, Scotland, Ireland, the United States, and many parts of continental Europe. The teachers were numbered by tens of thousands, the pupils by hundreds of thousands, if not millions; and in every town, and almost every village of the British Empire, the name of Raikes was honoured, lauded, perhaps to excess; but we do not wish to have bounds set to a people's gratitude towards a great, an unquestionable benefactor. I am not in possession of the history of particular Schools, save, it may be, one or two. This I know, that in 1787 Sunday Schools were established by the Unitarian Congregations of Birmingham, whilst they flourish there to this day. It is no unusual thing to find in them the grandfather, father, and son, engaged in imparting or receiving instruction, all from early youth having been connected with the School. The Birmingham jubilee was held in 1837. Medals were struck to commemorate the event; and I may be allowed to mention, that I have in my possession one of the silver medals presented to me by the Sunday School Committee.

(To be concluded in our next)

"MY FATHER'S HOUSE."

THE disciples had been stricken with sorrow, when Christ, at the last supper, distinctly informed them of his approaching removal: and no wonder that they should, for he had been to them the light and the strength of their life for years, and round him had gathered their fondest and brightest hopes. He would cheer and comfort them, and help them to bear their bereavement. Their hearts

were troubled, and he turns their thoughts to him who had been their fathers’ God and theirs—him to whom their devotions were paid—in whom they lived—from whom came down every good gift—their Father in heaven. He would still be their God and their guide, their guardian and their friend. The changes that pass over earthly scenes, and the desolation that severs earthly ties, in no degree affect him ; he is still the same, without variable-ness or shadow of change. On his kind and gracious providence they might repose ; and, catching the faith and holy trust of a prophet whose words must have been familiar to them, they might say—“Although the fig-tree shall not blossom, neither shall fruit be in the vines ; the labour of the olive shall fail, and the fields shall yield no meat ; the flock shall be cut off from the fold, and there shall be no herd in the stalls : yet I will rejoice in the Lord. I will joy in the God of my salvation.” But he exhorts them also to believe in him. He had uttered before them words of precious truth and comfort, and the doctrines he taught them had been confirmed by his mighty works and by his devout, holy, loving, and self-denying life. He exhorts them to believe implicitly and entirely in the assurance he had given them of the unfailing love of God, and of his ever watchful and minute care of every one of his children, and of the revelation he had made of another life. And then, as if it were the most important and consolatory word he could speak to them, he says—“In my Father’s house are many mansions : if it were not so, I would have told you. I go to prepare a place for you. And if I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again, and receive you unto myself ; that where I am, there ye may be also.” “My Father’s house !” How our Lord still turns to his Father, rests in him, and from him gathers all strength and consolation. When he came into this world, he came from his Father ; while he lived in the world, he sought to do his Father’s will ; and when he was leaving this world, he was returning to his Father. And when the disciples sorrowed, because he was about to leave this earth, he told them that they should rather rejoice when he said, “I go to my Father ;” and he speaks of his Father’s house as a home in which there is safety, and peace, and

joy. While our Saviour lived on earth, his home was evidently elsewhere. True, his heart was given to mankind—his love, his sympathy, and his compassion; but his sweetest communings were with a higher life, and he drew from it the holy influences that sustained and directed his life on earth. To that home he desired to lift the thoughts of his disciples; throughout his whole ministry he did so, but especially when a stronger faith in it was needful to support them in their bereavement. In that house he said there were many mansions. Some had asked—"Lord, are there few that be saved?" and some may have imagined that only for the illustrious men of their nation—the patriarchs and the prophets of past times, and the great ones of their own day—those who ministered at the altar, and offered the appointed sacrifices—was there admission into that region of the blessed. Christ would remove their apprehensions by saying, "there are many mansions;" and he adds, in the most earnest and affectionate manner, "If it were not so, I would have told you." He would not have flattered them with a vain expectation, or have deceived them by a false hope. "I go to prepare a place for you; that where I am, there ye may be also." He would thus cheer his mourning followers with the assurance of an admission into that heavenly home, and of a reunion with him there. They had rejoiced in fellowship with him on earth; that intercourse was only to be interrupted for a time: in that celestial home they would be admitted into a closer communion with him. Pleasant had been their intercourse with their Lord here, and holy had been the sentiments which his presence had awakened; but they had toil and anxiety, and were assailed with contumely and persecution. In that higher region, beyond the pains that harass and the storms that agitate our earthly being, they should be admitted into a blessed and abiding rest.

"There no fatigue, and no distress,
No sin, nor death, nor fears oppress;
No sighs shall mingle with the songs
That dwell upon immortal tongues.

"No rude alarms of angry foes
No cares shall break the long repose;
No midnight shade, no clouded sun,
But sacred, high, eternal noon."

When our Lord says, “that where I am there ye may be also,” he gives much ground for supposing, that in that heavenly home the disciples of Christ shall not only be with him, but with one another,—he, the first begotten from the dead, and raised to the right hand of the Father, and with him those who on earth have cherished his spirit and have sought to follow him. Thus may we entertain the reasonable hope that a communion may exist in that blessed state between those of distant climes and successive generations, varying in language and in opinion here, but there assimilated in mind and heart, susceptible of the same bliss, and kindled into the same devotion and love. And still more may we cherish the the confident expectation that those who were bound by the holiest ties of friendship on earth, may be united there in purer and more enduring affection.

When we consider the circumstances in which Christ speaks of his Father’s house, and the comfort with which his words are laden, we shall not wonder that they have been a favourite subject of contemplation and study in seasons of sorrow and in scenes of death. Many a time has the Christian, as he felt the power of disease sapping the foundations of health and weighing down his spirit, turned to this Scripture and read it over and over again, and felt that it breathed consolation, and raised hope and trust in his soul. And many a time by the bed of the dying, has pastor or friend read those sacred words, and felt that they were more than priestly prayer or Church ritual to sustain the sufferer. The words indeed express deep doctrinal meaning, for they distinctly teach that the Christian should believe in God, and, in addition to believing in God, should also believe in Christ, thus plainly implying that Jesus Christ is not God. But, in seasons of danger and bereavement, the human heart does not perplex itself with disputed doctrines; it seems only to open itself to Christ as he is revealed in Scripture, and to receive him in his sanctifying spirit and his holy and cheering promises. Sorrow and death are near to all, and it is true wisdom as well as duty on the part of Christians, to strive that their life shall be spent usefully, and in harmony with the spirit of their Saviour: then they may reasonably expect that his word shall bring them comfort

in the season of death ; and they may humbly trust that, after death, "where he is, there shall they be also," and that in him they shall have a re-union with those who have been taken from them—those who are "not lost, but gone before."

REVIEW.

UNITARIANISM IN THE PRESENT TIME, ITS MORE IMPORTANT PRINCIPLES, ITS TENDENCIES AND PROSPECTS. By JOHN ORR. Pp. 270. 8vo.

THIS Volume, to most of our readers, will possess a two-fold interest : its subject is one in which they are deeply concerned ; and its author is a minister of their body, already favourably known beyond the bounds of his own Church by his treatise on Theism, which elicited marked commendation from several of the leading Reviews. The present volume aims, as the Preface states, "to describe Unitarian principles, the changes that recent influences have induced upon them, the impediments that lie in the way of their progress, and their probable future."

A difficulty is felt in the outset in defining what Unitarianism is, and our author frankly admits that any attempt to describe the characteristics of the system in a way that would satisfy all minds, would be utterly hopeless : and he further states, that "such are the liberal and non-sectarian tendencies of the Unitarian faith, that the majority of those who acknowledge its principles refuse to found their Church on any doctrinal basis however simple." Whether this statement be correct with regard to the majority of Unitarians, we have no means of determining ; but that many who profess the Unitarian faith resolve it into mere free inquiry, whether that results in accepting a divine revelation or rejecting it, is painfully true. In the present state of the Unitarian Church, all free inquirers would seem to be admissible, and we can see no good reason why the Congregation of South-Place Chapel, Finsbury, should be excluded, who recently re-

monstrated with their minister for being too evangelical; for making a great deal too much of the Saviour; for preaching all about Christ, and nothing about Socrates; for glorifying Paul, and saying nothing about Pythagoras; for delighting in the Psalms of David, and ignoring the Confessions of Rousseau; for sometimes taking a lesson from Solomon, while they had a preference for Poor Richard! This worshipping Society profess a belief in one God, the Father, and, according to the latest expositions of Unitarian faith, must be pre-eminently Unitarian. What a striking and melancholy change has passed over the Unitarian Church in England from the time when its most honoured ministers were the ablest and most earnest apologists for Divine Revelation, while now it needs the greatest refinement of casuistry even to suggest a difference between its newest phase and mere Deism. But, while Mr. Orr admits the impossibility of determining the doctrinal views which characterize the denomination, he has, throughout the volume, given just prominence to the Scriptures, and assumed the authority of revelation and the divine mission of Christ as tenets of the denomination. He has also exhibited, in parallel columns, the opinions of the "Orthodox" and the Unitarians on the principal subjects of theology; and the statement of Unitarian belief there expressed will be found free from the extravagances which have been recently advocated.

Our limits will not permit us to consider the several chapters of Mr. Orr's volume. That on Christ and Christianity is particularly interesting, especially the portion of it which treats of Inspiration; in a brief space it exhibits with much force the unreasonableness and untenableness of "plenary inspiration." In the chapter on Unitarianism in the Present Time, the change which has taken place in the opinions of the leading minds of the denomination on "human nature" is, as we believe, truly given in the following passage:—

"The doctrine of human nature, traditional with us, may be thus given—First, every faculty and feeling constitutional in us is legitimate, and deserves recognition and development: Second, every child born comes into the world with a moral nature undisfigured, or in no way injured, by ancestral transgression or by any hereditary influence. Within the present century, however, inquiry

has brought forth, and established on an adamantine basis, the doctrine of the transmissibility from generation to generation of qualities of character. What our fathers were, either in natural disposition or in acquired habit, we are likely to be. Even the peculiarity of the individual may, in the lapse of time, become perpetuated as the characteristic of a race. Bodily weakness is hereditary ; mental and moral weakness is also hereditary. Requiring to co-ordinate its received doctrine of man with these unquestionable truths, Unitarianism has lowered its tone in reference to the natural endowments of the child ; and, among things to be extirpated or corrected, numbers particulars of inborn perversity, as well as particulars of acquired evil habit. The second of the propositions just given, consequently, has been disowned by the most instructed of modern Unitarians. An inborn moral derangement is recognized as possible, nay, as exemplified in daily instances ; and the responsibility of man magnified in the consideration that the evil proclivities he superinduces on himself are likely to be bound as an inheritance of evil on certain of his descendants. In this, however, we exactly reverse the estimates of the received theology ; for in it man is viewed as responsible for the obliquities of his forefathers, whilst, in that which we substitute in its place, man is held responsible for certain of the infirmities entailed on his descendants.”—Pp. 76, 77.

Our author argues for the permanence of Unitarianism from its Scripturality, from its consistency with itself and general experience, from the tendencies of science, and from the “Signs of the Times.” And we believe, that notwithstanding its unpopularity, and the elements of discord that have been introduced into it, it is destined to live and grow. Already the foundations of the English Church have been shaken : the Calvinism of the Presbyterian Church, much as it now prides itself on its unity and strength, must be its destruction as education advances : while the superstition and tyranny of the Church of Rome render it unsuitable for a free and enlightened people. We see in Christian Unitarian principles a faith which rests on Scripture and common sense, which welcomes every discovery which science brings before it, and which secures to all the utmost freedom—political, social, and religious.

Mr. Orr thus concludes a very able and very interesting volume—

“Whatever change may ensue in the accidents of our theology, we believe, however, that its essentials will remain as they are. We believe that the great principles which characterize it now,—of one God the Father, of Jesus the impersonation of the attributes

of God, of religion sanctifying the life, of reconciliation attainable by repentance,—will never depart from it. We believe that the Unitarian will always go to the Christian Revelation, and especially to the more spiritual elements that it contains, for the source of his religion and the inspiration of his goodness. We believe that the Unitarian will always be free; tolerant of differences; repudiating standards of orthodoxy; and trusting to inquiry for the downfall of the worthless, and the establishment of the good and the true.”

BELFAST DOMESTIC MISSION.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CHRISTIAN UNITARIAN.

DEAR SIR,—An article in your last number, under the heading of “A Mission to Mothers,” is well calculated to call attention to the claims of those who are continuously, as well as more especially, suffering from the ills to which flesh is heir, on the sympathy and kindness of their more fortunately placed brethren. It is indeed, as you most properly observe, refreshing, in the midst of controversy, to know that the philanthropic spirit of the Gospel is not stifled in any Christian denomination, but that whatever sectarian differences may exist, there is, in all, an earnest desire to promote beneficent schemes for the temporal and spiritual condition of their fellow-men. And in this spirit—that of Christian love and fellowship—the article under notice is evidently written. I may be allowed, and in common I am sure with every one of your readers, to express my hearty thanks for its opportune appearance; for now, in very truth, is the accepted time for works of benevolence. “The chief business of our being,” remarks the pious Lindsey, “lies in the present hour, because the next belongs not to us, and may never come.”

The Domestic Mission has great extent, and the utmost diversity in its operations. It is not, *per se*, an alms-giving Institution,—it aims at a much higher good than supplying the needs of the day passing over the heads of all,—yet it cannot develop a healthful mode of action without in some sort caring for the wants of the body. In vain we preach to him who is ready to perish—in vain speak of faith and holiness, and the necessity of running well the appointed race, to the man who has not the necessaries of life; nor, it must be obvious, is it pleasant to say to such a person, be you warmed, clothed, and fed, and then depart without an effort made to relieve him. Nor can the minister of religion, the professed comforter of the distressed, expect to do much good where the means are not in his power to relieve, however slightly or temporarily, the sorely pressing evils he is compelled to witness. In every Domestic Mission a “Poor’s purse” has been found indispensable to the Agent’s success among those to whom he is peculiarly sent. He could not pursue his labours a week, scarcely a day, without its aid; and yet the most liberally supplied purse,

is often found miserably inadequate to the purpose. By no means must there be indiscriminate giving, nor should there be acting on mere impulse; yet there are cases, and of frequent occurrence, where pity must give ere charity begins,—where, though the wanderings may be chidden, the pain must first be relieved,—where we cannot stay to consider the merits of the case before us, but are irresistibly impelled to supply, and at once, wants that are so patent and so urgent.

And this brings me to the main object of my present communication. I would desire to supplement what you have so admirably begun,—to furnish, if you will permit, an application to the sermon so eloquently and pathetically delivered. You have advocated the claims of the Belfast Domestic Mission, and especially of the newly added and valuable agency, the Missing Link, on the cordial support of our religious body, and in doing so have earned the gratitude of all interested in its well-being. Respectfully would I venture to call attention to the fact that the Mission needs constant and liberal aid; and in connexion with this, to the printed Rules of the Missing Link Agency,—more particularly to the 9th, 10th, and 12th, and with especial reference to the last of these, where it is said that “There shall be a store for providing comforts for the sick in connexion with the Mission,” with the “N.B.—It is earnestly requested that contributions of stores suitable for such a purpose may be sent in to the care of the Rev. Thomas Bowring.”

Now, such a store must prove of the greatest use in our Missionary operations. There are, my dear friends, numbers of sick persons whom we see, and these, from day to day, greatly need comforts such as we hope to bestow on them. The family earnings, at the best, under the most favourable circumstances, are seldom more than sufficient for a season of health. Let one of the members be sick,—suppose the father or the mother,—and great privation and distress must be the consequence. Besides, the sick require better, more nourishing food than those who are well; but, as a rule, they cannot procure it. So far as we can, we must do it for them. We want rice, sago, arrow-root, pearl barley, sugar, and peas for soup, with other things necessary for a sick dietary. A most kind friend of the Mission has made a very acceptable commencement in this direction. We most earnestly hope it will be promptly and effectively followed up. Will it be allowed to add, that we find acknowledgments of such articles as those enumerated in the English and American Reports, and put at the disposal of the office-bearers. Most gladly as well as thankfully shall I receive any such into my custody, to be appropriated, with the sanction of the Ladies' Committee, for the benefit of those who are unable to purchase for themselves. At a small individual cost, great good can thus be effected. God loves the cheerful giver; and he that sows bountifully shall reap also bountifully.—Respectfully yours,

THOMAS BOWRING.

23, CARLISLE STREET, BELFAST.

THE ELDER AND THE PRESBYTERY OF ANTRIM.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CHRISTIAN UNITARIAN.

DEAR SIR,—In common with many of your readers, I have been anxiously expecting, for several months past, to see an authoritative disclaimer, on the part of the Presbytery of Antrim, of the sentiments which have of late been publicly and frequently ascribed to a leading Elder of that reverend body; and I confess myself greatly surprised and disappointed that nothing of the kind has yet appeared, and that no notice whatever seems to have been accorded to the subject by any member of the Presbytery at any of its late meetings.

The particulars of this very extraordinary case are easily explained. It appears that so long ago as the 29th December last, the Rev. Dr. Montgomery, during his speech at the public dinner at Carrickfergus, on the occasion of Mr. Cleland's ordination, is reported to have said—"This is a statement of an Elder of the Presbytery of Antrim,—rather a distinguished Elder,—one who voted stoutly for the admission of your (Carrickfergus) Congregation into the Presbytery of Antrim. He says—'It was our design to build up a Church which should not be exclusively *Christian in any sense*; which would admit Christians, Deists, Pantheists, Hindoos, and Mahometans. *Atheists* would not be excluded; and even if a minister became an *Atheist*, he should not be required to resign.'"

This very remarkable statement was fully reported in *The Belfast News-Letter* of the next morning, and thus circulated over the length and breadth of the North of Ireland and elsewhere; yet in the ordinary quarterly meeting of the Presbytery of Antrim, held a few days afterwards, a strange and utter silence formed their only response to this weighty charge.

In *The Christian Unitarian* for March the same statement was twice repeated,—once in the report there given of Dr. Montgomery's speech, and again, in the most pointed manner, in an article entitled "A Free Church—What does it Mean?"

I understand that it was next repeated or alluded to by yourself, in the course of a public lecture in Belfast. It was afterwards printed by the Rev. J. S. Porter, in the Appendix to his Lecture—"The New Theology," where he uses it as a *proof* of the propositions there contained. This Lecture was published in London and Belfast, and reviewed by *The Inquirer* and *Non-Subscriber*; yet no notice was taken by either periodical of these serious allegations, and the Antrim Presbytery still remained silent on the subject.

April came, and the time for the next stated meeting of that Presbytery. Expectation stood on tip-toe. What would they do? Of course, at once proceed to investigate the whole matter, and either authoritatively contradict the statement if untrue, or, finding it true, indignantly disavow and repudiate all participation in such designs and sentiments, and take all proper and available means to dissociate themselves from such persons as might be found to hold and to have expressed them, and to prevent them remaining and exercising authority as members of their Presbytery. Such, at least, seemed, in the humble opinion of your correspondent and others, to be the only course open, under the circumstances, to any

body of men meeting together as *Christians*, and professing to form a *Christian Church*. But, I am sorry to say, the Presbytery of Antrim seem to have thought differently; for, notwithstanding the wide publicity which these charges had obtained, they allowed their meeting to pass over without, so far as the public are aware, the slightest notice being taken of them,—without deviating from the *total official silence* which they had theretofore preserved on the subject!

Seeing that the Presbytery, rather than move in this important matter, had, for reasons best known to themselves, allowed judgment to go against them by default, you, Mr. Editor, charitably took up the cause of the unfortunate Elder, whom his own Presbytery dared not venture either to defend or disavow; and, in an article entitled “An Elder Vindicated,” in the *Christian Unitarian* for May, you showed, with terrible and unanswerable logic, that the opinions of the Elder, totally absurd and licentious as they are, are yet the legitimate offspring—the necessary result—of the principles now advocated by the leading ministers of his Presbytery, viz.:—“That absolute religious liberty is the principle, and free inquiry the essential bond of union, of the Presbytery of Antrim.”

This seemed to your readers to bring the matter home to that Presbytery so unquestionably, that, if they had any remnants of that high sense of duty—any spark of that true Christian principle by which the *old* Presbytery of Antrim was wont to be distinguished—they would at once, and at any sacrifice, have taken measures entirely to vindicate themselves and their Church from the serious charge of holding, participating in, or in any way countenancing such anti-Christian and destructive views; and to visit, with their disapprobation and censure, anyone who might be found to have expressed such sentiments, while holding the responsible position of an Elder of their body. But, *O tempora, O mores!* still no movement—no word—no sign! They would not, or they *could not*, do it; and again they allowed “silence to give consent.” Another month passed over. And, in the last *Christian Unitarian* (for June), in an article on “Free Inquiry,” in which the conclusions drawn are “plain as way to Parish Church,” the subject is again brought forward,—the same words repeated—the same grave accusation made. But all in vain! The Presbytery of Antrim, once celebrated for its high-minded and fearless Christian integrity, now silently lies under this deep reproach. Are the fears of those who predicted that it had entered on a downward course, to be, indeed, so soon and so completely fulfilled. Is the *facilis descensus Averni* to be so strikingly exemplified in its career?

For the sake of pleasant memories of times gone by—for the sake of past and present associations—for the sake of Christian principle and Gospel truth,—I would still hope, that the Presbytery of Antrim may awaken to a sense of its paramount duty, and may be able to find some way of relieving itself from this stigma and reproach; but, judging from the past, and from the facts of the case, I am reluctantly obliged to confess, that it seems very like “hoping against hope.”—I remain, Sir, faithfully yours,

June 15th, 1863.

A NON-SUBSCRIBING PRESBYTERIAN.

THE LATE MEETINGS.

OUR Intelligence department contains a condensed report of the proceedings of the Remonstrant Synod and the Non-Subscribing Association, at their meetings, held in the past month at Banbridge. In the former body no important discussion took place, as the Carrickfergus case was considered *in interloquitur*, and the "Three Questions" do not appear to have been brought forward. We understand that a very full and interesting report was given in by the Committee having charge of the Carrickfergus case, and a memorial was presented by Commissioners from the Congregation. These, or the substance of them, we may see reason to publish in our next number. The spirit displayed by the Master of the Rolls in the Ballyclare case, and the fact that lawyers may regard the Three Questions as a creed, are certainly calculated to embarrass the Synod; but we have all confidence in their prudence and their determination to do all in their power to vindicate the rights of the Remonstrant party in Carrickfergus. We are much pleased to know, that the deliberations of the Synod were characterized by an earnest and peaceful spirit, and that attention was given to various matters affecting the interests of religion in the Church.

The meeting of the Non-Subscribing Association was, throughout, unpleasant, and satisfactory only in the result—an all but unanimous resolution to adjourn *sine die*. Immediately after the roll had been called, the Secretary asked leave to read a Protest against the admission of the Northern Presbytery, which had been forwarded by the Rev. James Orr, of Clonmel. The absurdity of an absent member sending in a Protest against an act of the Association after an interval of twelve months, without any notice of such Protest having been given, was so unprecedented that there should have been no discussion on it; however, the Rev. S. C. Nelson, by speaking in favour of Mr. Orr's Protest, astonished the meeting, inasmuch as he was the man, who, when the Northern Presbytery applied for admission, eagerly rose, before the gentleman who had intended to move the motion had time to do so, and after some highly complimentary expressions respecting the leading members of the body, moved, "that the Northern Presbytery of Antrim, holding the principles of this Association, be now, and are hereby, recognized as one of the bodies constituting the Association of Non-Subscribing Presbyterians." But more than astonishment was excited, when Mr. Nelson went on to say, that at Comber he had, in proposing that they be received, expressed his belief that they had abandoned the principles of Non-Subscription. It was evident that he was thus cunningly endeavouring to show that he had spoken "the unspoken speech," and several ministers denied that he had uttered any such sentiments on the occasion. In this attempt, which was quite in character with "the cunning epistle" which he wrote for a similar purpose, he was fairly caught and exposed. A vote was taken respecting the reading of Mr. Orr's protest, and it was decided that it be not read. By the practice of the Association, the President is chosen in succession from the several

constituent bodies, and, by right, should this year be a minister of the Northern Presbytery. A ridiculous objection was made by Dr. Ritchie that they were a young Presbytery, and that it would not be judicious to entrust to any of them a responsible office!—and he moved that the Rev. W. Hall, of the Antrim Presbytery, be the President. Mr. Bruce, or Mr. J. Scott Porter, too young to be entrusted with the Presidency, and therefore it should be committed to the venerable minister of Greyabbey! On this point there was much discussion, Mr. Nelson again assailing the Northern Presbytery, and, by one of his characteristic tricks, attempting to read, as a part of his speech, Mr. Orr's Protest. The meeting indignantly exclaimed against his doing so, and he was called to order by the chair. Before the vote on this question was taken, Mr. Porter, in a few telling sentences, repelled the accusation of Mr. Nelson that he was not a Non-Subscriber, declaring, that on the principle of Non-Subscription his mind was, and as far as he knew and believed, would continue, unchanged. The roll was then called, and Mr. Porter was elected President. Next came on the consideration of the time and place of next meeting. The Rev. W. Crozier proposed that the Association should return to their original practice of meeting triennially, and expressed a hope that in the course of three years the agitation that now unhappily distracted them would have subsided. On this subject several ministers and others spoke, some proposing a longer adjournment, and some arguing for the continuance of annual meetings. Mr. Nelson spoke in favour of meeting annually, and expressed a hope that before a year peace might be restored, and a third time he attacked the Northern Presbytery. Mr. M'Alester exposed the inconsistency of Mr. Nelson hoping for peace while, again and again, he was taunting the Northern Presbytery with having violated their principles, and casting upon them the most unjust imputations; he contended that he and his co-Presbyters held the same principles of Non-Subscription which they had ever held—the same which they had inherited from the founders of their free Christian Church. After a lengthened and rather warm discussion it was agreed—only one member dissenting—that the Association adjourn *sine die*. Some routine business was then transacted, and the meeting separated.

So long as the opposing parties hold conflicting opinions respecting Non-Subscription, we see no common ground of union, and no good, but much evil, in their meeting together. There is one course, and one only, which would restore peace. We believe that many of the ministers, and the great majority of the laity, would strongly condemn the ordination of any candidate in a Non-Subscribing Church, who did not acknowledge a divine revelation, and believe in the divine mission of Christ. *Let the Presbytery of Antrim only declare that they will ordain no man who does not believe in the Scriptures as containing a divine revelation, and peace is immediately restored, and all dissensions healed. As Non-Subscribers, we ask no more,—as Christians, could we ask less?*

INTELLIGENCE.

OPENING OF THE NEW UNITARIAN CHURCH, DUBLIN.

THE beautiful church recently erected in Stephen's Green, Dublin, by the Congregation hitherto worshipping in Strand Street, was opened on Sunday, June 14. The Rev. G. A. Armstrong, pastor of the Congregation, conducted the devotional services from the liturgy which has been lately adopted. The dedication prayer was offered by the Rev. W. James, of Bristol, who also preached from Romans xii. 1.—“I beseech you therefore, brethern, by the mercies of God, that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, which is your reasonable service.” The church was crowded in every part, and the services throughout were most impressive and gratifying. Immediately after service a meeting of the Congregation was held, and a resolution was unanimously adopted conveying their cordial thanks to Mr. James, for his admirable sermon, and requesting, for publication, a copy of the sermon and of the appropriate dedication prayer.

The building is not less remarkable for the vigorous and graceful treatment of the exterior, than for the ingenuity and economy displayed in its internal arrangements. It is most ingeniously planned, so as to embrace a spacious church, two large school-rooms underneath, with separate approaches to each, committee-room, vestry, &c., all provided conveniently and effectively in a street site of comparatively limited frontage. The church has been opened free of debt, the entire cost, including the site, being about £7,000.

REMONSTRANT SYNOD OF ULSTER.

The annual meeting of this body was held in the First Presbyterian meeting-house, Banbridge, on Tuesday, July 21, and continued its sittings on the two following days. There was a good attendance of ministers and elders. The moderator (Rev. Joseph McFadden) conducted devotional exercises, and preached an eminently practical and very impressive discourse from Romans xi. 13.

After the roll had been called, the Rev. James Callwell, Glenarm, was unanimously elected moderator. Mr. Callwell, on ascending the pulpit, thanked his brethren for the honour they had conferred on him. He trusted and believed that all the ministers and elders attending the Synod would bear in mind that they were members of a Christian Church, and that in all their discussions they would so conduct themselves as to give him little trouble in discharging the duties of his office; and that should he fail in doing his duty, he would receive the support and advice of his fathers and brethren.

The Rev. J. A. Crozier (Ballymena) was re-appointed to the office of Clerk—the Rev. John Orr, Comber, acting as Assistant Clerk.

The Rev. Dr. MONTGOMERY assigned several reasons for holding the annual meeting at an earlier period than they had been accustomed to do, and moved that the next meeting be held in

Belfast on the third Tuesday of June, 1864. The motion was seconded by the Rev. William Crozier, and was unanimously passed.

The Rev. C. J. M'Alester being present, was invited to sit and deliberate with the Synod, but, for reasons assigned, declined to do so.

The Reports of Presbyteries were then received. In that of the Armagh Presbytery there was nothing of importance. The report of the Bangor Presbytery referred to an irregularity which had arisen in the withdrawal of the Congregation of Ravara from the Synod, which led to a difficulty in having the Meeting-house re-registered. A correspondence between the Registrar-General, and the Revs. J. Jellie and J. A. Crozier, was read on this subject. The Report of the Carrickfergus Committee was read, after which the Synod adjourned, to meet the next morning *in interloquitur*.

On Wednesday, at 10 o'clock, the synod met *in interloquitur* when the consideration of the case of the Carrickfergus Congregation was resumed; and the Report of the Synodical Committee and a memorial from the Congregation having been received, resolutions condemnatory of the proceedings of the seceding party in the Congregation, and declaring their published statements to be "defamatory of the practice of the Synod" were unanimously adopted. A resolution was also passed, regretting and censuring the proceedings of the Presbytery of Antrim in this matter; and the unanimous thanks of Synod were voted to the Committee for their zealous and indefatigable labours in behalf of the rights and interests of the Synod and their Congregation of Carrickfergus during the past year.

The Synod having adjourned at twelve o'clock (the hour for the meeting of the Non-Subscribing Association), met again at ten o'clock on Thursday morning, when further resolutions were adopted in relation to the Carrickfergus case—appointing a new Committee to take charge of the Congregation for the ensuing year, to act as they might deem expedient for the promotion of its peace and prosperity, and with power to convene a special meeting of Synod if at any time circumstances should seem to render it necessary; and also recommending the Congregation to transmit the fair and amicable proposals, set forth in their memorial, for a settlement of the case, to the seceding party, in whatever way should seem best. The Synod then entered on the consideration of various subjects of a practical nature bearing on the general interests of the Church, and the business was brought to a conclusion at 3 o'clock in the afternoon.

NON-SUBSCRIBING ASSOCIATION.

The Annual Meeting of this Body took place in the First Presbyterian Meeting-house, Banbridge, on Wednesday, the 22nd July, at twelve o'clock. There was a very large attendance of ministers and elders, and a most numerous and highly respectable Congregation assembled on the occasion, comprising many influential members of various religious denominations in the town and neighbourhood. The introductory services were conducted by the Rev. J. Scott Porter, and a sermon was preached by the retiring President,

the Rev. Dr. Montgomery, from Hebrews xiii. 7, 8. The subject was the permanent character of the Christian religion, and the sermon was marked by the eloquence and power for which the rev. preacher is so justly distinguished.

On the calling of the roll, Dr. Logan objected to Mr. Laird being received as an Elder from Ballyclare, alleging that he was Elder from that Congregation. The Rev. J. S. Porter rose and said that Mr. Laird was the Elder, not from a small portion of the Ballyclare people, but from the great majority—the bone and marrow, and he might say the life-blood of the Congregation. Mr. Laird was received as Elder in connexion with the Northern Presbytery of Antrim.

After the roll had been called, it was moved that a Protest from the Rev. Mr. Orr, of Clonmel, against the reception, at last Annual Meeting, of the Northern Presbytery of Antrim as a constituent part of the Association, be read. The President ruled against the reading; but the motion was urged by the Rev. S. C. Nelson, who went on to inform the meeting what he had said at Comber; several ministers declared that he had said no such thing, and that it was the “unspoken speech.” The motion was put to the vote, and rejected by a majority of 30 to 25. The question of the election of a successor to the Rev. Dr. Montgomery in the office of President was next considered, when it was moved by Dr. Ritchie (Elder), and seconded by the Rev. John M'Caw, that the Rev. William Hall, of Greyabbey, be appointed. The Rev. William Crozier moved, and the Rev. John Montgomery seconded, that the Rev. J. Scott Porter, of Belfast, be chosen President of the Association. A lengthened discussion ensued, some members supporting the election of Mr. Hall, and others that of Mr. Porter. The Rev. S. C. Nelson stated, that although he had moved the reception of the Northern Presbytery of Antrim, he now felt that he had committed an error in doing so, inasmuch as that Body had departed from the principles of Non-Subscription; he hoped, however, that they would yet retrace their steps. In the course of his remarks, he read from a paper which he held in his hand; but it was soon discovered that this document was the Protest of Mr. Orr, which the Association had previously decided should not be read. From various parts of the house a cry of “shame,” “shame” was raised; and several members objected to his being allowed to proceed. Mr. Nelson contended that he had a right to read anything he pleased in evidence. The President, however, decided that the document could not be read, and he was supported by the general feeling of the house. The Rev. C. J. M'Alester remarked that the real question seemed to be—was the Northern Presbytery of Antrim a constituent part of the Association, or was it not? If it was, it was right the President should be chosen from their number; but if not, they were quite willing to retire, and thus relieve themselves from much unpleasantness.

On proceeding to vote as to whether Mr. Hall or Mr. Porter should be President, the Rev. J. Scott Porter said that in accordance with the practice of Presbyterian bodies, it devolved upon the members who had been put in nomination to address the brethren

if they wished, and having done so, to vote and to withdraw. He hoped that no member would vote for him with the idea that he was about to change his course or retrace his steps: the part he had taken in the recent conflicts had been prompted by a deliberate conviction of duty. He stood before the meeting the same man he had ever been. If the meeting thought that he, being such as he was and is, was capable of serving the body in the capacity of chairman, he was at their service. He would only add, that he was now, as he had been through life, as warm and zealous friend as any in that Association, to the great principles of the sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures, the right of free inquiry and private judgment, and the rejection of all human authority in articles of religious faith. Mr. Porter then voted for Mr. Hall and withdrew. Mr. Hall in like manner voted for Mr. Porter and withdrew. The roll being called, Mr. Porter was elected, the votes being, for Mr. Porter 31, for Mr. Hall 25.

The Rev. J. SCOTT PORTER having taken the chair, thanked the meeting for the high honour which had been conferred upon him, which was especially gratifying as a proof that he still possessed their confidence and esteem, and was very consolatory to his feelings under the obloquy to which he had been exposed in consequence of adherence to his conscientious convictions of truth and duty. He claimed the assistance of the brethren in his endeavours to discharge the duties of the chair. He did not consider himself as the President of any side or section of the Association, but of the entire Body, and would endeavour to secure for every member the free and full utterance of his opinions upon every proposition which might be laid before the Association. He then called upon the Honorary Secretary to proceed with the business for which they were met.

The Rev. Hugh Moore was unanimously re-appointed Secretary.

On considering the time and place of next meeting, the Rev. WILLIAM CROZIER moved, that the Association recur to its original practice of meeting triennially instead of annually, as at present, and that, accordingly, the next meeting be appointed to take place in Belfast, on the third Wednesday of June, 1866. Mr. Crozier alluded to the unfortunate differences and alienations which had arisen between several portions of the body; which, as had been already illustrated in the proceedings of that day, had quite convinced him, and he was sure many others who had witnessed them, that the recurrence of their meetings so frequently as once a year, could neither be useful nor agreeable. He thought that by allowing three years to intervene before the next meeting, time might be afforded for the settlement of many of the existing differences, and for a better understanding to arise between the opposing parties. The Rev. Classon Porter said, that Mr. Crozier had not gone so far as he would be disposed to go, as he wished for an adjournment of the meeting *sine die*; but, looking upon it as an instalment towards that object, he would willingly second Mr. Crozier's motion.

Mr. NELSON spoke in support of meeting next year; he expressed a hope that ere that time the brethren who abandoned Non-Subscription would return to their former principles. His remarks

were very much a repetition of his previous speeches,—accusations against the Northern Presbytery of having ceased to hold the Sufficiency of Scripture, and having adopted a human creed.

Mr. M'ALESTER rose to support Mr. Crozier's motion. He could not understand how Mr. Nelson could expect that peace should prevail in the short space of a year, while he was repeating again and again the most unjust accusations against his brethren of having departed from the principles of Non-Subscription. It had been alleged that a legal opinion was against their views of Non-Subscription, but he begged to say that he did not go to counsel, or even to the judicial bench, for his religious principles. Early in life he had espoused the same views which he now held on the subject of church government, and he was as earnest an advocate as any on the other side for the Sufficiency of Scripture, though possibly he might differ from some as to what was meant by "the Scriptures." He saw no prospect of a better understanding arising in a year; he would therefore vote for an interval of three years before the next stated meeting.

The Rev. J. A. CROZIER argued, by reference to the original constitution of the Association, as adopted in 1835, that neither the Remonstrant Synod nor the Northern Presbytery had departed from its principles.

Amendment after amendment was moved, some wishing for an adjournment *sine die*, others for three years, and others only for one year; but at length, one member only dissenting, an adjournment *sine die* was carried. The Report of the Committee and that of the Treasurer were received, a new Committee was appointed, and the meeting broke up.

CONGREGATIONAL SOIREE.

A soiree was held in the First Meeting-house, on Wednesday evening, to which the Ministers and Elders attending the Association were invited. There was a very large attendance, the spacious meeting-house being nearly filled. A considerable number of the ministers were present. After tea, James Dickson, Esq., Gilford, was called to the chair, and introduced the proceedings by a few appropriate remarks. The following sentiments were then given from the chair: "Our beloved Queen—may she be long spared over a loving and united people, and may her family inherit the virtues which have adorned her reign, and rendered her a blessing to the nation,"—spoken to by the Rev. W. Crozier. "The principles of Civil and Religious Liberty, our inheritance and our boast: may they triumph over every form of oppression, and prevail throughout the world,"—to which the Rev. J. Scott Porter responded. "Our Holy Christian Faith: may its sanctifying and comforting truths influence our heart and regulate our life, and thus train us for that inheritance of bliss which it reveals,"—responded to by the Rev. Joseph M'Fadden. "The benevolent Tendencies of the age" to which the Rev. M. Getty spoke. "The Young of our Congregations: may they ever be faithful to the principles of Christian freedom and piety which they have inherited,"—spoken to by the Rev. C. J. M'Alister. The Rev. James Lindsay (Methodist Minister) spoke to "The friends of other religious per-

suasions who have favoured us with their countenance and their company;" the Rev. J. A. Crozier to "The Ladies;" and Mr. John Smyth, Jun., acknowledged a vote of thanks passed to the Stewards. The Rev. J. S. Porter conveyed the thanks of the ministers and elders to the chairman and the meeting for the pleasant and, he hoped, profitable evening they had spent; and the proceedings were closed by devotional services conducted by the Rev. John Montgomery. In the course of the evening several pieces of music were performed on the organ, at which Mr. Cooper presided.

BELFAST DOMESTIC MISSION.

The half-yearly examination of the children attending the Mission Schools took place in the Stanhope Street School-rooms, July 2, in the presence of many of the friends and supporters of the Institution, including Rev. J. Scott Porter, Rev. T. Bowring; V. Whitla, Esq.; R. Nesbitt, Esq., School Inspector, and several ladies. The Boys', Girls', and Infants' departments numbered in the whole 211, and presented a very interesting spectacle, from the neatness of their appearance, and their orderly and respectful demeanour; a marked improvement in these respects was visible, reflecting high credit on all concerned. The examinations were well conducted by the several teachers, assisted by some friends present, whilst the children's answers shewed that they had profited materially by the pains bestowed on them. A number of premiums, consisting of books, and useful articles of clothing—the kind gifts of Mr. and Miss Whitla—were awarded to the more deserving of the scholars; a nice cake, from the same generous hands, was given to each child in the rooms. Some pleasing musical pieces, with the National Anthem, were sung with much spirit; and, with hearty cheers from the boys, the assembly broke up for the holidays.

OBITUARY.

Died, at Moira, on June 30, John, son of the late Mr. Joseph Smyth, Moira, in the twentieth year of his age.

Died, at Larne, on June 21, Miles Atkinson, Esq.

Died, at Manchester, on July 20, Ann, relict of Robert Greenfield, Esq., formerly of Ballyclare.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

"What the Scriptures Teach, No. 6," and "Annual Meeting of American Unitarian Association," held over for want of space.

Communications for the Editor, to be addressed by post to Rev. C. J. M'Alester, Holywood; or, otherwise, to 45, Arthur Street, Belfast.

Orders for the work and business communications to be sent to the Agent of the Unitarian Society, 45, Arthur Street.

THE
CHRISTIAN UNITARIAN.

VOL. II.]

SEPTEMBER, 1863.

[No. 8.]

WHAT IS CHRISTIANITY?

[The following paper appeared originally in the Boston *Christian Examiner*: and, if we rightly interpret the appended initials, is from the pen of the learned and eloquent successor to Dr. Channing, the Rev. Dr. EZRA STYLES GANNETT. We have much pleasure in transferring it to our pages: and cordially agree with the Editor of the *Christian Register*, by whom it has been reprinted, that "its just and excellent sentiments cannot fail to be read with interest and profit."]

WHAT is Christianity? To this question what various replies are made! Every sect has its own interpretation of the Gospel. Every intelligent believer has his own conception of what it is. They who regard it with equal reverence may differ widely when they come to explain it, for men's apprehensions vary where their appreciation is the same. Let us give our answer; not in the cold, rigid statements of a creed, but in the words which a rejoicing faith adopts, when it seeks utterance for the emotions as well as the convictions which it begets. Others speak confidently. Our belief is not less strong nor happy than theirs. Why then shall not we speak with confidence? We are condemned and misunderstood. Let us, if possible, place ourselves in our true position before and among our fellow-Christians. The question which we have proposed concerns us as much as them. We have the same right with them—and it is equally our duty—to make answer before the world. What is Christianity?

We answer, first, *it is a divine communication.* And this we say in respect alike to its source and its character,

in reference both to its early history and its inward operation. Christianity came from God directly and miraculously. It is was not of human, but of divine origin. Christ was a divine messenger, the chief of all the messengers who ever bore instruction from heaven to earth. We believe in Christianity as a divine production, just as we believe that the world in which we live, the material system of things, is a divine production. Man did not make it, and could not make it; it is not a human work. Man did not discover it: it is not the fruit of study, nor the result of insight. It is a revelation—an immediate and extraordinary communication from the Almighty. It is not necessary for us to define the precise method of this communication: we need not attempt to expound, or master the philosophy of inspiration. The terms which we have used are definite enough, and are intelligible by everyone.

Christianity, we believe, in the first instance, came from God to Jesus and his Apostles as a direct illumination, and they delivered it as instruction which they had received immediately from the Divine Spirit. It contained more than could have been collected from the stores of human wisdom, or have been shaped into the form and bearing of a religion for the world, by the most laborious skill or the most clear-sighted philanthropy. Upon the first disciples it acted with the force of a divine influence, and they recognized in its influence the action of truth flowing from God through channels which he had supernaturally opened. And in our times, and in all times since the Gospel was preached by him whom "God anointed with the Holy Spirit and with power," the action of Christianity, whether upon the individual or on society, has been a divine action, inasmuch as it has been the action not of what man has discovered, but of what God has promulgated.

We therefore bow to the authority of the Gospel. We allow of no appeal from its declarations of doctrine or duty. When we have ascertained what Christianity teaches, we stand in reverence before the mind and will of God. Our appeal is from all other instruction to this: In the examination of the writings through which we obtain an acquaintance with Christianity, we use all the

fidelity which we should exercise in the study of any other documents purporting to contain important matter; and, having satisfied ourselves that these are what they purport to be, we interpret them by the same laws which we apply to other writings; and we know not how else to arrive at their meaning. But having by such investigation informed ourselves of the truth as it is in Jesus, we accept that truth, and abide in it, and rejoice in it, and glory in it. It is to us the "wisdom of God, and the power of God." We do not sacrifice our reason on the altar of faith, for we have never found in Christianity anything repugnant to reason, nor should we expect that a communication from God to man would confound and throw discredit upon the highest faculty which he has given to man. But we are willing that reason should be taught, and we place it at the feet of Jesus, to listen—not at his side, to dispute.

Christianity is to us a divine communication. We receive it, we honour it as such. It is authoritative, it is final with us. We reject much of the belief of other Christians, not because we do not like it, but because we do not find it in the Gospel. We value the good thoughts and wise sayings of past ages. We are thankful for the assistance which those who are toiling along with us in the highway of life can give in surmounting its discouragements or in discerning the forms of things around us. And we trust that future generations will be wiser and better, more far-sighted and more simple-hearted than we are.

But amidst the past we see one light brighter than all the rest, we hear one voice clearer than all others; and that light we know was kindled by God's own hand, and to that voice we hearken as to the voice of God himself. The help which we get from our fellow-travellers we feel is an insecure and treacherous reliance, when it is not offered in the meekness of a heart which recognizes Christ as the infallible guide. And as we anticipate the brighter days of the future, we neither expect nor desire for our race a period when Christianity shall cease to be the sun of the moral heavens. We admire those in our day who consecrate themselves to reform, and we hold in honour the memory of some who in ancient times rose above the absurdities of heathenism. But we can never place Ben-

tham by the side of Paul, nor name Socrates in the same breath with Jesus. We believe in miracle, in inspiration, in Christianity as a divine communication.

What is Christianity? We answer, secondly, *it is a message of mercy*. Man lay in the bondage and gloom of sin when Christ appeared as a messenger from God. He had separated himself from his Maker. The consciousness of sin disquieted him. He felt himself to be guilty, and in various ways sought to avert the displeasure which he knew must settle upon him from offended heaven. Whether Jew or Heathen, he recognized a Power above himself, whose authority he had contemned or defied. He felt his need of forgiveness. He saw the necessity of terminating the variance between himself and the unseen Object of his worship. It is one of the most remarkable facts in human history, that man has always been troubled at the thought of his own sinfulness. Conscience has pointed him to One higher than himself, and as he has looked up he has trembled, for he has felt his unworthiness and ill desert. Hence the holocausts he has heaped on sacrificial altars. Hence the human victims he has immolated. Hence the penances he has inflicted, alike on the body and on the spirit, and the self-destruction by which he has hoped to atone for his offences.

All these things proclaim the universal feeling, where Christianity has not lifted the burthen of guilt from the soul. And where Christianity is known, it has only increased the sense of guilt by giving new force to the great truths of duty and accountableness. Man is now a sinner, everywhere a sinner. Go where we may, we find sin assailing and cleaving to humanity. In the palace and in the hovel, with the student among his books, and with the peasant in the field, is sin to be found, in actual contact with the life of man. Innocence is seen only in childhood, perfection belongs not to earth. That which is universally true is universally confessed, at least in the soul's privacy. There is a universal acknowledgment of the need of pardon. The sinner must be reinstated in the divine favour, and be delivered from the peril into which his sins have brought him.

Such is the condition and such the consciousness of all mankind. Christianity meets the case which is here represented. It is a message of mercy from the Being in whose presence sin is disloyalty and impiety. God will forgive the sinner who repents and "brings forth fruits meet for repentance." No one need despair, not even the chief of sinners. God will freely forgive those who turn unto Him, to do His will. He is reconciled to those who reconcile themselves to Him. This is the burthen of the Gospel; and this, perhaps more than anything else which belongs to it, makes it the Gospel—the glad tidings. God's mercy is sufficient for the wants of the world. This was the truth which Jesus taught. Yea, more; it was the truth which he died to place beyond all denial. Calvary attests the mercy of God. The cross has established it for ever.

Yet welcome as the revelation of mercy must be to the conscience-stricken sinner, many have been withheld by their fears from embracing it. The Christian doctrine of mercy has been disfigured and encumbered by human theories, till its divine features could scarcely be discerned beneath such perversions. We believe in this mercy, as it stands in the Gospel, free, full, and imposing only the condition of a return to duty through a living faith. The man who believes in Christ so heartily as to forsake all that he may follow Christ, will obtain pardon for his offences, and need no longer anticipate the divine displeasure. His sins are forgiven, for in him the atonement has taken effect—the reconciliation, that is, which restores him from a disobedient to an obedient child, from a rebellious to a loyal subject.

In the views which we entertain of the divine mercy, we differ considerably from large numbers of our fellow Christians, who think we do not give a sufficiently prominent place to this mercy. It seems to us strange that we should be so misunderstood. We flee to the mercy of God as our only refuge; we cling to it as did the ancient Israelite to the horns of the altar, as where neither vengeance nor despair can follow us. We would not give up our confidence in the mercy of God for all that heaven and earth could offer; for without it heaven would be no heaven, and earth would be a hell.

And we cherish this confidence because Christ has given us encouragement and instruction to this effect, and has even died that it may be sealed in his blood. Therefore do we believe in a mercy large enough even to cover our guilt. When men ask us, what reliance or hope we provide for the sinner whom we call to repentance, we reply—"That which Christ provided—the mercy of God." Yes, we believe in mercy, announced, pledged, applied in Christ.

What is Christianity? We answer, thirdly, *it is an instrument of regeneration*. We have seen in what a state Christianity found the world; a state of guilt, disobedience, and estrangement from God. Man was enslaved and polluted, for passion had corrupted him, and temptation had led him captive. Mankind were sunk in depravity. God had "made man upright, but they had sought out many inventions," by which the soul was deluded, debased, and enfeebled. Christianity came to raise man out of this state. It came to deliver him from his sins, through repentance and a change in heart and life. It came to reform the character, and so to renew the man—to change, not its nature, but its exercises—to establish a new dominion within him, and to open a new world to his view in what he saw around him. Therefore was the instruction of Christ directed first and chiefly to this point. He sought the sinner, that he might rescue him from his degradation; and he addressed him as a sinner, that he might at once remind him of what he must do.

The regeneration of the human heart, by which its dispositions, desires, and purposes should be deprived of the evil quality which affected them, and be filled with that holy element which should convert them into acceptable offerings on the altar of religion, this was the object for which the Gospel was bestowed, in view of the immediate wants of man, and this the result which it was intended in its primary action to accomplish. This result was witnessed.

There is not a more remarkable chapter in the history of our race, than that which records the change which Christianity wrought in the early believers,—turning selfishness into love, and avarice into generosity, and sen-

suality into self-denial; making the effeminate manly, the ambitious humble, the revengeful meek, the formalist a spiritual worshipper, the irreligious devout and exemplary; converting a persecutor into an Apostle, a hypocritical disciple of Moses into a sincere follower of Jesus, an idolatrous and profligate Pagan into a real Christian! What more could we say than is conveyed by this last expression to him who understands, on the one hand, the requisitions of Christianity, and on the other, the habits of Pagan life? What a contrast do they present! Yet how often was it realized in the experience of the same individual.

Such was the operation of Christianity in its commencement. But its work is still regeneration. Men are still corrupt. The world is full of wickedness. Men are depraved; depraved by their own will and act, but only the more depraved because their will consents, and their own act aims the blow at the soul's integrity. They need to be converted, to be changed, now as much as in the days of Christ and his Apostles. They need to have their attention arrested, their thoughts turned in upon themselves, their souls cleansed, their lives reformed. The visible change will, in most instances, perhaps, be less strongly marked, but the effect, which may be traced to the Gospel, will be scarcely less stupendous, and in no degree less important, than was produced in Jerusalem or Corinth.

We believe, therefore, in regeneration—as a work which it is the office of Christianity to effect, by bringing the soul to a voluntary relinquishment of all its evil habits, and the adoption of new principles and exercises. We believe in depravity—as the condition into which all mankind are brought by the force of temptation, acting upon ignorance and weakness; in human, but not in natural depravity; in universal, but not in total depravity; in acquired, but not in hereditary depravity. We believe that the first step in obedience is repentance. We believe in Christianity as the great instrument of regeneration.

(To be concluded in our next.)

WHO ARE TO BE OUR MINISTERS?

It is worth while to bestow more than a passing glance on the sort and description of young men who are coming forward to supply the pulpits in our churches, and to be the pastoral "guides, philosophers, and friends" of the rising race. It is matter of rejoicing and hope that so many give evidence of high ability, great learning, and deep and serious piety; but it would appear that there are also some whose views and tendencies are calculated to fill the minds of earnestly religious persons with alarm, as to the nature of the influence which they will probably exercise on the minds of their hearers. A respected correspondent informs us that he has lately had opportunities of hearing, more than once, religious services conducted by students of one of the theological seminaries patronized by the Unitarian body in England; and he states, with regret, that all of those young men whom he heard, "with the exception of one, or perhaps two," seemed to him "to exclude the supernatural element from religion altogether," and "*almost to ignore the office and character of Christ.*" Although some of them indicated their preference for the New Theology, "rather perhaps by expressive silence than by open avowal," yet others "flung their crude opinions at the head of their auditors rather unsparingly." One young minister, lately a student, declared from the pulpit that "*the Bible is the great Fetish of the age:*"—that "*miracles are Fetish:*"—that "*the proofs of immortality are conflicting,*" adducing the opinion of Comte, "*that belief in a hereafter is perhaps but a sign of cerebral disease;*" and affirming that "*the existence of a Deity cannot be proved.*" He "passed a high panegyric upon the doctrine of necessity: *necessity itself, considered as a principle, he almost deified:*" and "concluded by describing a sort of visionary ladder," at the top of which he placed the "Perfectionist, or man of highest intellectual and scientific culture," whilst at the bottom "*lay the Christian, resting all his faith and hope ON A MAN MURDERED FOR HIM!*" (*sic!*) The general strain of the preaching of all these young gentlemen was "*adverse to every supernatural element in the Scriptures;*

and nearly all of them seemed to deny or evade the great doctrine of the resurrection of Christ." He adds that the novelties which they introduced were not exclusively doctrinal: "one of them gave a prayer in blank verse; and another introduced rhymed sentences in his addresses to the Deity."

Such announcements are melancholy enough, as they affect the spiritual interests of the present generation; they occasion serious apprehensions with respect to the "church of the future." However, they can excite no surprise in those who consider the pains which have been taken to impress upon the minds of ministers and church-members, the notion that to ask of a young man before he is sent forth to preach the Gospel, whether he "believes in Christ" or not, is to insult him, to interfere with his Christian liberty, to trample on free inquiry, to erect an inquisition in the church, to deny the sufficiency of Scripture, to act the part of an intolerant bigot, to repress the noble aspirations of generous youth and large-hearted manhood, &c., &c. These are easy topics for declamation. Many a man has made to himself a name for liberality and eloquence by vapid and vapouring harangues on such topics, shouted on all occasions, suitable or unsuitable. When young men are taught, as they are taught by such declaimers, that the basis of their church is not agreement in any point of doctrinal opinion,—not even belief in the existence of a God,—but simply the right of private judgment,—and the fullest recognition of every form of opinion,—no matter what the nature of those views may be to which the mind of the inquirer has been led,—it is no wonder that youths, whose doctrinal conclusions are utterly at variance with the teaching of the Bible, or who even think that the wider their deviation from the commonly accepted beliefs of the Christian world, the more they are to be commended and approved as men of vigorous, original, and independent thought, should be tempted to enter upon the sacred work of the ministry. It is notorious that this notion of independence and originality is often combined with the most servile copying of the words and thoughts, style and manner, of the speaker or writer from whom they have adopted their sceptical opinions.

In this country we have not yet got so far as the openly avowed rejection of the supernatural element in the religion of the New Testament: at least such manly outspoken infidelity is not presented by the adherents and abettors of the "New Theology" in their pulpit services. It is believed that, although individual hearers might be gratified by such plainness of speech, the majority of the congregations even of what is called the "*liberal* section of the Non-Subscribing Church," would not tolerate that style of preaching. Yet we have had here also, examples of a preference for the extreme anti-supernatural views, indicated "rather by expressive silence than by open avowal." Religious services have been known to be conducted for a series of weeks and months without the least reference, in prayer or sermon, to the office and character of Jesus as "the Christ, the Son of God;" or to the Gospel as the expression of the divine counsel communicated to the Saviour, and through him to the children of men. At times these topics may indeed be mentioned, but exclusively in the way of historical reference to the opinions held by the evangelists, and the other writers of the New Testament, without one word to imply that the preacher accepts or adopts their statements. The hearer is simply reminded that "Matthew informs us of this fact:" or that "St. John maintains that doctrine:" or that "St. Paul declares the truth of such and such an opinion." The orator copies the Recorder's address to the citizens in one of Shakespear's plays:—

"Thus saith *the Duke*; thus hath *the Duke* inferred:
But nothing spoke, in warrant, from himself!"

We must add, that if any ambiguous voices are scattered in depreciation of the miracle of Christ's resurrection, or the evidences of a future life, *the public services of the pulpit* are not, in this country, made the vehicle for sending them abroad: and so far as has come to our knowledge, none of our ministers has, as yet, ventured to affirm that "the Bible is a Fetish;" or, with Comte, that "the belief of a hereafter is perhaps but a sign of cerebral disease:" that is, *a symptom of insanity!* But with the advance of liberality and the march of intellect, we suppose this may be looked for, "*when time is ripe.*"

We must not be understood as casting any censure on the young men whose views are "adverse to every supernatural element in the Scriptures," for "denying or evading the great doctrine of the resurrection of Christ," and the many similar facts affirmed in the Four Gospels. We do not even find fault with the Rev. Gentleman who regards "*the Bible as the great Fetish of the age*,"—who thinks that "miracles are *Fetish*,"—and who places "the Perfectionist, or man of highest intellectual and scientific culture," infinitely above the Christian, who, as he conceives, "*rests all his faith and hope on a man murdered for him*,"—for plainly and openly stating his sentiments. He has a perfect right to form his opinions, to hold them, and to avow and defend them. But we humbly venture to suggest to "the men of progress," that those who wish to avow and defend such opinions, ought to seek some other field for their labours than *the Christian pulpit*; and we cannot but express our grief, astonishment, and indignation at the indifference or supineness of the persons, be they who they may, who sent forth young men holding such opinions, as qualified to minister to a Christian Congregation on the Lord's Day, and to assume the oversight of them as "ambassadors for Christ." We are both surprised and shocked that any society of religious men should be willing to accept the pastoral services of gentlemen, however able, eloquent, or learned, who tell them that the existence of a God is incapable of proof; that belief in immortality is perhaps only a symptom of insanity; and that the Bible,—the great source of religious truth, holiness, consolation, and peace, "is the great Fetish of the age:"—in other words, *the object of the most corrupt, grovelling and disgusting superstition upon earth*:—for that is just the meaning of the word *Fetish*!*

Are these the men from whom are to be selected the pastors who are to minister to us and to our

* "FETICHISM:—The worship of idols among the negroes of Africa; among whom the Fetich is an idol; any tree, stone, or other thing worshipped."—*Worcester's English Dictionary*.

"FETICHE:—The name which the nations of Guinea in Africa give to their divinities. They have a *fétiche* for a whole province, and particular *fétiches* for each family. This idol is the stump of a tree, the head of a monkey, or a bird, or something of that sort according to their fancy."—*Encyclopédie de Diderot et d'Alembert*.

children, and to our churches in the days that are coming, the spiritual nourishment needful for growth in goodness? If so, may God defend and guard his church; for dangers threaten her! In Him we put all our trust: nevertheless we would wish the friends of vital religion to be upon their guard: for God works ordinarily through human instrumentalities; and we must watch as well as pray.

THE ORIGIN AND AIM OF SUNDAY SCHOOLS.

SUBSTANCE OF AN ADDRESS TO THE TEACHERS OF THE SUNDAY SCHOOL UNION, BELFAST. BY THE REV. THOMAS BOWRING.

(Concluded from p. 235.)

FROM an interesting memoir in the Sunday School Magazine, we are informed that the Sunday School at Dukinfield was founded in 1800, by the late venerable and truly excellent Mr. Hawkes, afterwards of Lincoln, and who ended his most useful life at Nantwich, the worthy successor there, though remotely, of Dr. Priestley. The school at Dukinfield was first held in the meeting-house, from thence transferred to a garret, but some years subsequently to a building erected for the purpose, and this has given place to a much larger and far superior house, replete with every accommodation, in which a numerous assembly of both sexes meet every Lord's Day. A very pleasing circumstance is connected with the history of this school. On Mr. Hawkes leaving Dukinfield, the children subscribed their pence to purchase for him a silver cream jug,—one young woman working overtime in the mill for some weeks, that, with her extra earnings, she might enable some of them who could not of themselves afford it, to contribute their shares,—a very pleasing instance of self-denial, and as pleasingly told by Miss Edgeworth, to whom the fact had been related, in one of her little narratives—that entitled “The Silver Cup.” And here must be noticed the Unitarian Sunday Schools of Exeter, Bristol, Flowery Field, and Birmingham (Hurst Street), with all of which I have been at different times intimately acquainted. But merely local narratives do not usually prove interesting to those who live remote

from the scenes of action ; and I take leave of this branch of our subject to say a word—and it must be a brief one—on the aim of the Sunday School Movement,—for from the first it had an aim—a great, nay, a sublime one—too frequently, it is to be feared, lost sight of, yet which we should do well to ever keep in view, as the pole-star to direct our progress, as the goal of all our labours and aspirations.

The grand object of the Sunday School teacher should be progress in the divine life, but to be made only through moral and spiritual culture. Now, it is to be feared that we have sometimes thought so much of the machinery as to forget that this machinery is simply the power we possess to attain the desired result—the means, and not the end. We have been so proud of our locomotives—of their wheels, their cranks, their well-oiled and shining gear—as to lose sight of the object of the journey itself, or of its termination. In other words, we have been so captivated by the show of numerical strength, the large returns of scholars and teachers, the size and appearance of our school-rooms, and the diversity of things taught in them, our connected institutions, our libraries, our unions, our breakfast and tea-meetings, our transcendent, or rather, our transcendental speeches, with our glowing reports, as to weaken, if not deaden, our spirituality, and to cause the thoughts to dwell far less on the moral good to be effected, than on the outward means which “make a fair show in the flesh,” and yet in their influences may be most deceptive, if not positively pernicious. I must confess myself to be more and more averse to secularizing Sunday Schools. I have no belief in Sunday School Mechanics’ Institutes or People’s Colleges. Let the great work of secular education go on, and let it prosper by every manner of means. But there is a time for all things. Six days in the week give ample time for instruction in the common things of life ; and there is not a child in the three kingdoms who is of necessity thrown on the Lord’s Day for a merely secular education. I would have the three or four hours devoted on the Sunday to the instruction of the young, entirely occupied in conveying religious knowledge, especially the knowledge of the Scriptures. Reason as we may, and refine as we may,

there is nothing to be compared with this knowledge. To the poor and the ignorant it is the pearl of great price. It elevates them in the social scale; it has a direct tendency to calm their otherwise turbulent passions; it promotes the growth of virtuous habits; it leads to the recognition of the hand of God in the events of life, and of his eye being constantly on them; it thus causes a sense of responsibility, whilst it makes the example of the Redeemer very operative and his name very dear, and thus fosters the goodness which is profitable both for this life and that which is to come. Without being a Sabbatarian, in the conventional use of the term, I yet have so much of the Puritan as to feel that a marked distinction should be made in the employments of the day of rest from those of the other six days of the week; and I therefore heartily desire that our Sunday Schools should be seminaries of religious instruction, and that the single aim of the teachers should be to feed the lambs—the little ones in Christ—with his doctrine, setting before them his pure and holy and loving life, that thus they may be led to the throne of him who, whilst he dwells in light inaccessible, is the God and Father of us, as well as of the Lord Jesus.

And in connexion with these remarks, I cannot but think it of very high importance that Sunday School children should, with their teachers, be considered as belonging to recognised Christian societies, and be caused to partake with them of the privileges of the sanctuary. They should be attached to our churches as forming parts of the same body. They should be taught to unite with the congregation in the services of the house of God. Not otherwise will they learn to love the place where his honour dwelleth. Wherever it is practicable, a place should be appropriated in the meeting-house for their accommodation; and this I imagine to be a better plan than having a separate religious service for them; for it is well to habituate them early to consider themselves as members of a Christian society, where adults of all ranks and ages are to be stately found, and where continually the prediction of Holy Writ is fulfilled—"Instead of the fathers shall be the children."

Let me, in conclusion, say that I cordially approve of

the system of Sunday School instruction pursued in this country among ourselves,—religious in the truest, because in the strictest sense, and carried out most successfully by an earnest and zealous band of teachers—persons of superior education, and of deep but cheerful and unaffected piety. May it ever be thus, that the feeble, struggling ones of Christ's flock be duly tended and encouraged,—that those out of the way be brought in,—that the fold be continually enlarged, till there be no more wanderers, and none in danger of being finally lost. We, my dear friends, have our responsibilities, and these are very great; but we must faithfully discharge them, and then, when the Chief Shepherd shall appear, we shall receive a crown of glory that fadeth not away.

THOMAS BOWRING.

MR. BRUCE IN REPLY TO THE REV. S. C. NELSON'S
ACCUSATIONS AGAINST THE NORTHERN PRESBY-
TERY OF ANTRIM.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CHRISTIAN UNITARIAN.

DEAR SIR,—It has been my anxious wish to keep as clear of all personal concern in those unpleasant controversies which have been agitated among us, as my official position would allow; and I entertained the hope, that we were gradually settling into a state of quietude, though not of harmony. But I find, by your report of the meeting of the Non-Subscribing Association in Banbridge, and from personal testimony besides, that Mr. Nelson has so rudely persisted in charging the Northern Presbytery of Antrim with a dereliction of principle, notwithstanding the assurances given to the contrary, as to amount to a very distinct imputation of prevarication or want of veracity—an imputation that only reflects disgrace on the person who made it. In addition to repelling the charge, as you and Mr. Porter have done, I feel compelled—as I was not present to take part with you in this matter—to put on record my firm conviction, that Mr. Nelson knows, as well as I know, that neither my co-Presbyters nor I, have, in any manner whatever, swerved from that fundamental principle on which we engaged in the ministry :

which was, that we should have full and unrestricted liberty of preaching Christ, each according to the dictates of his own conscience,—the principle of not allowing any human authority to supersede the authority of Christ, or to bind us to any code of doctrine,—and therefore of repudiating altogether subscription to any confession, creed, or other formulary of faith, devised for such dictation and restriction of Christian Liberty. We conceived, and we still conceive, that this is the true principle of Non-Subscription; that Non-Subscription has no reference to that acknowledgment of the truth of the Christian religion, and that submission to the authority of Christ in his Church, which must precede any purpose of entering into the ministry, but only to those formularies of faith that prescribe the particular doctrines to be taught, everyone of which has been disputed without prejudice to the truth of the Christian faith.

I can say, from more than fifty years' intimate converse with the Presbytery of Antrim, that this is the view of Non-Subscription which was always taken in that body. I can also state, that I never knew a time when that Presbytery would have adopted a congregation which had left the communion of another Presbytery, on the express ground that they would allow the Presbytery to make no inquiry into the religious qualifications of the person whom they chose to be their minister, but would expect them simply to ordain him on their application, as was the case with the York Street Congregation; nor would they have sanctioned a schism in a cognate Presbytery, where there was no charge of any encroachment upon liberty of conscience, nor any charge of any authority having been claimed other than had always been exercised by the Presbytery of Antrim; that, namely, of satisfying their own minds that the person whom they were called upon to ordain had the essential qualifications of a Christian minister. I do not believe that there ever was, during the period of which I speak, a congregation within the bounds of the Presbytery which would have construed Non-Subscription to mean a refusal to avow openly, as the foundation on which the Presbytery licensed and ordained ministers, a firm belief in the divine origin and authority of the Christian religion; or which, while

maintaining for their minister the right of conscientiously interpreting the Scriptures for their edification, instead of enunciating the doctrinal decisions of Councils, Assemblies, Synods, or Presbyteries, would have considered that they were, at the same time, asserting the right of any one to occupy a Christian pulpit, who would refuse to profess his firm belief in the divine origin and authority of the Christian religion, and his obligation to preach Christ; or which would not have considered the avowal of such principles to be indispensable and unchangeable—not to be a submission to any dictation of human authority, but the acknowledgment of the supremacy of Christ as of paramount obligation. In this opinion I feel assured that my respected friend, the late Mr. Carley, who was coeval with me in the Presbytery, would have fully concurred.

I feel convinced that nothing short of a foregone determination to force the York Street Congregation into the Antrim Presbytery, as the commencement of a system of schismatical aggressions on the Presbytery of Bangor and the Remonstrant Synod, could have led to such a departure from the plainest sense of the language used by the original Non-Subscribers in the expression of their sentiments: who would, assuredly, have been vastly surprised at such a perversion of their views as would break down the barriers between Deism and Christianity.

The unlimited adjournment of the Association was, under the circumstances, a very judicious step; for where they met, and were likely again to meet, with a determined spirit on the part of several to calumniate and insult their brethren, there was little probability of any co-operation for any common purpose.

My reluctance to enter again upon any matters that leave an unfavourable impression of some of my brethren in the ministry, has been overcome by a feeling that I owe it to my co-Presbyters to join with them in repudiating a false and slanderous charge.—I remain, &c.,

WILLIAM BRUCE.

BELFAST, *August 6, 1863.*

CONGREGATIONAL MEMOIRS.—No. II.

LARNE AND KILWAUGHTER CONGREGATION.

(Formerly called Enver, or Inver.)*

SUCCESSION OF MINISTERS.

1627—1637. GEORGE DUNBAR, A.M.

[A vacancy of nine years, with occasional supplies from Scotland.]

1646—1695. THOMAS HALL.

1700—1712. WILLIAM OGILVIE.

[At whose death the Congregation divided about the choice of a minister.]

1715—1716. JAMES HOOD.

1717—1775. JOSIAS CLUGSTONE.

1755—1795. ROBERT SINCLAIRE.

1796—1807. JAMES WORRALL.

1807—1832. JAMES CRAWFORD LEDLIE, D.D.

1834. CLASSON PORTER.

IN placing my own Congregation second on the list of these Congregational Memoirs, I am aware that I give it a position to which, even within the local area which I have marked out for myself in these papers, it is not chronologically entitled. The Congregations of Antrim and Templepatrick are both its seniors. But with respect to these two older congregations, the materials which I have hitherto been able to collect are not by any means so complete as I should wish to make them; and besides, I confess that, remembering the uncertainty of all things human, I am anxious to take the earliest

* "The name Inver ('the mouth of a river') was an old name of Larne, and refers to the position of the town at the mouth of the Larne water, anciently called the Ollarba. The name Larne, as a parochial denomination, is but of modern date, being originally applied to a civil territory called Latharna by the Tripartite Life, and other early authorities, and being borne by a Tuogh, which, in the 17th century merged in the Barony of Upper Glenarm. The ancient territory called 'The Larne,' comprised the Parishes of Cairncastle, Killyglen, Kilwaughter, and Larne. In the Antrim Patents of 1621-1630, the town is called *Inverr-in-Laherne*. In the Down Survey it is marked *Inver alias Learne*. In 1622, the union, consisting of the next named Parish and this, was styled 'Unio de Invermore et Inverbeg.'—*Reeves's Eccles. Antiq. of Down, Connor, and Dromore*, Pp. 54, 55.

In conformity with the foregoing account, the Presbyterian Congregation of which we are now to speak was called "Inver," or "Euver," until about the year 1680, when the name Larne begins to be introduced in the records; the designation of the town having, in this instance, as in the similar case of Belfast and Shankill, been ex-

possible opportunity of putting together, in a comparatively permanent form, the records—now perishable—of a congregation in which, of course, I take a greater interest than any other. I must again beg the reader to bear in mind, that it is mainly for the preservation of these old records that I trouble either him or myself with these Congregational Memoirs.

I.—GEORGE DUNBAR, A.M., (1627—1637,) the first minister of Larne, came, like most of the other Presbyterian ministers of Ulster at that period, from Scotland, where he had been for a length of time minister of Ayr, and had been twice ejected for his attachment to Presbyterianism. “He was for a time” (says Stewart in his MS. Hist.) “prisoner in Blackness; and in Ireland first preached at Carrickfergus, but having no entertainment there, staid a while at Ballymenagh, then came to Larne or Enver; by whose means all that country heard the word, and were first gathered unto the Lord.” Livingstone, in his “Memorable Characteristics,” adds, that when the messenger of the High Court of Commission came to Mr. Dunbar’s house in Scotland the second time, a young daughter of his, turning, said, “Is Pharaoh’s heart hardened still?” All that Mr. Dunbar said, was to

tended to the surrounding district. But in the year 1715, when the Congregation was divided in consequence of a difference of opinion as to the choice of a minister, the Secessionists, who lived, perhaps, mostly in the district which is still called Inver, took the name of Inver, or Enver, for the congregation which they then formed, and which, even in the present day, I have sometimes seen called “Larne and Inver;” whereas the people of Kilwaughter, on the occasion alluded to, naturally adhering to their landlord, Mr. Agnew of Kilwaughter, whose family were for many generations the patrons of the Larne Congregation, the minister of the Old Congregation was, in the Kilwaughter Leases (by which the tenantry on that estate were bound to pay a part of their rent in the shape of stipend), called “the Protestant Dissenting Minister of Larne and Kilwaughter.” This ancient ecclesiastical union I have, in the cases of our Congregational Sunday-School, Library, Young Men’s Christian Association, and latterly of the Congregation itself—had much pleasure in reviving. *Esto perpetua.* Whilst I am upon these topographical matters, I may mention that the line of local division, which I apprehend, to a great extent separated the two congregations at the disruption (*viz.*, the Larne water), continues to a great extent to separate them at the present day. The great bulk of my congregation, out of the Town of Larne, reside in the Parish of Kilwaughter. The majority of the other congregation, out of the Town of Larne, reside in the “Four Towns of Inver.”

his wife to provide the creels again, for the former time the children being young, "they behoved to carry them away in creels upon horseback. Therefor he was settled at Inver, near Lochlairn in Ireland." "After these two" (says Blair of Bangor, in his Life), *i.e.*, after Colvert and Welsh—"the Lord brought over to Loughlearn old Mr. George Dunbar, after he had been deposed from his ministry at Ayr by the High Commission, and banished by the Privy Council. At Learn the Lord did greatly bless his ministry, and he and the other two having joined the monthly meetings, the word of God grew mightily, and his gracious work prospered in their hands." Mr. Dunbar is commonly called the first Presbyterian minister of Larne, and so undoubtedly he was. In his Irish settlement, he maintained the Presbyterian discipline and ritual for which he had suffered in his native country. But he received Episcopal ordination in Ulster at the hands of Bishop Echlin, according to the convenient compromise which Blair has described in his Life, and which I have already detailed in my notice of Mr. Brice's settlement in Broadisland.* In his ordination to the

* Dunbar may have been ordained by Knox, Bishop of Raphoe, as were, at this time, Welsh, Livingstone, and others of similar sentiments; Echlin having latterly refused to ordain any more ministers, unless they promised strict conformity to the English ritual. But the method of ordination employed by Bishop Knox—who was of the same family as the Scotch Presbyterian Reformer, John Knox—was at least as lax as that which had been used by Bishop Echlin in the case of Blair and others. It is thus described by Livingstone, as exercised towards himself:—"Because it was needful that I should be ordained to the ministry, and the Bishop of Down (Echlin) being a corrupt humorous (?) man, and would require some engagement; therefore my Lord Clanniboy sent some with me, and wrote to Mr. Andrew Knox, Bishop of Raphoe, who, when I came, told me he knew my errand; that I came to him because I had scruples against Episcopacy and ceremonies, according as Mr. Josias Welsh and some others had done before; and that he thought his old age was prolonged for little other purposes than to do such offices. That if I scrupled to call him my Lord, he cared not much for it; all he would desire of me because they get there but few sermons, that I would preach at Ramullan the first Sabbath, and that he would send for Mr. Cunningham and two or three other neighbouring ministers to be present, who, after sermon, should give me imposition of hands; but although they performed the work, he behoved to be present; and although he durst not answer it to the State, he gave me the Book of Ordinance, and desired that any thing I scrupled, I should draw a line over it on the margin, and that Mr. Cunningham should not read it. But I found that it had been so marked by some others before, that I needed not mark anything; so the Lord was pleased to carry that

Parish of Larne (or Inver), he acknowledged the Bishop "as a Presbyter," and allowed him as such, "along with the adjacent brethren," to lay his Episcopal hand upon his head. By virtue of this quasi-Episcopal induction, he preached in the Parish Church of Larne (so long as he was allowed to preach in Larne at all), and enjoyed the parochial tithes; but with all due respect for my ecclesiastical predecessor, I may be allowed to question the propriety of this compromise into which he and the other Presbyterian ministers of his time entered with the Episcopal authorities of Ulster. The truce on both sides was evidently hollow—and we are not surprised to find that it did not survive the necessity which suggested it, viz., opposition to a common enemy—the aboriginal Roman Catholics of Ireland. At the time of the Plantation of Ulster, in which Presbyterians largely took part, the Irish Episcopalian Church admitted, by a back-door, Presbyterian ministers within her pale, when she could get no others to maintain the Protestant cause; but, so soon as she thought she could dispense with their services, and had stricter Episcopalians ready to occupy their vacant places, she had no hesitation in expelling them from offices which, I think, they should never, under the circumstances, have condescended to fill.

business far beyond anything that I had thought or almost even desired."—*Livingstone's Life*, p. 12.

This was, indeed, "making things pleasant." Episcopal (!) ordination thus managed was thoroughly Presbyterian. It was almost "Non-Subscribing." The convenient laxity of Bishop Echlin in this case is equalled only by "an arrangement" which I have known to be made previously to a "Non-Subscribing" ordination; according to which the ordaining minister and the young man to be ordained slept together the night before, and settled between them what "questions" were to be asked, or if any questions were to be put at all!!! That certainly *did* exceed Bishop Knox's accommodating liberality.

[We apprehend that there was no irregularity in the matter, except the omission of the objectionable words in the form of ordination. There was at that time no law in Ireland requiring subscription to the Articles or the Book of Common Prayer previous to ordination; and the established Form of Ordination then, as now, not only permitted, but required, as it still requires, concurrence of Presbyters in the "Ordering of Priests," and more especially in the act of laying on of hands. The case is otherwise in the "Making of Deacons:" there the Bishop alone has power to ordain. The term *humorous*, applied to Bishop Echlin, is a correct reading: it means *full of humours or caprices*, and is manifestly intended as a censure against the inconsistencies with which his lordship was charged in his conduct towards Non-Conformists.—ED. CHR. UN.]

Mr. Dunbar arrived in Larne at a very critical period in the religious history of that neighbourhood. The entire Presbyterian population of the district was convulsed (as it has since been in our own time) by "The Revival," which, about the year 1627, attended the outrageous preaching and exertions of Mr. Clendinning, of Oldstone. "This man," says Stewart in his MS. Hist. "seeing the great lewdness and ungodly sinfulness of the people, preached to them nothing but law, wrath, and the terrors of God for sin; and in very deed for this only was he fitted, for hardly could he preach any other thing. But behold the success. I have seen them myself stricken as in a swoon with the word—yea, a dozen in one day carried out of doors as dead, especially about that river commonly called the Six-mile-water, for there the work begun at first; then after at Larne by Mr. Dunbar. For a short time this work lasted as a sort of disease to which there was no cure, the poor people lying under the spirit of bondage, and the poor man who was instrument of it,* not being sent, it seems, to preach the Gospel so much as law, they lay for a time in a most deplorable condition." To the same effect, writes Mr. Adair in his MS. History:—"The Gospel flourishing by the ministry of his servants, and no public opposition being made thereto, and all Satan's devices proving abortive, he was at last let loose to devise a pernicious devise. There being many converts in all their congregations, the devil did set himself mainly against the people about *Loch-Learn*, by this stratagem. He playing the ape upon some ignorant persons, did counterfeit the work of the Lord in the midst of the public worship. These persons fell a mourning, and some of them were afflicted with pangs like convulsions, and daily the number of them increased. At first both pastors and people pitying them, had charitable thoughts, thinking it probable it was the work of the Lord; but

* "Afterwards," says Blair, "he (*i.e.*, Clendinning) was smitten with a number of erroneous and enthusiastic opinions, such as that persons turning in bed after they fell asleep, was an evidence of their want of faith in the truth of Christianity; condescending upon a short day as the day of judgment; and affirming that whoever would join with him in a ridiculous way of roaring out some prayers, lying with their faces on the earth, would undoubtedly be converted, and the like. Finally, embracing one error after another, he set out at last on a visit to the Seven Churches of Asia."—*Blair's Life*, pp. 61, 62.

thereafter in conference they could find nothing to confirm these charitable thoughts. They could neither perceive any sense of their sinfulness, nor any panting after a Saviour. So the minister of the place (Mr. Dunbar of Larne) did write to some of the brethren to come thither, and with him to examine the matter. They coming and conferring with these persons, they found it to be a mere delusion and cheat of Satan's to slander and disgrace the work of the Lord." In reading these extracts, every inhabitant of Larne must, I think, be forcibly struck with the observation which has occurred to myself while transcribing them, that in this matter of "Revivals" history has, in our neighbourhood, and within our own knowledge, most minutely and in every particular reproduced herself.

In addition to this equivocal "Revival Movement," Mr. Dunbar, during his ministry at Larne, took part in another religious work which was unquestionably good, and which, as it must have been at the time fraught with heart-comfort to the ministers engaged in it, was undoubtedly attended by solid and permanently beneficial effects. I allude to the "Monthly Meetings" at Antrim, of which a very interesting contemporary account has been given by Blair and Livingstone in their respective Lives. It is recorded of Mr. Dunbar, that on one occasion after his return to Larne from one of these meetings, the good old man had in his sermon been "regretting with great grief," as many a minister has had cause to do before and since, "that he thought none of his people had gotten good by his ministry; when one Robert Brown rose and said before them all that *he* had gotten good; so after that there appeared a blessed change wrought on him and several others." (*Livingstone*, p. 87.) Singularly enough, the success of Mr. Dunbar's ministry at Larne is recorded in the case of another hearer, who, like the foregoing, was also called Brown. "Andrew Brown," says Livingstone, p. 22, and the circumstance is thought worthy of record by Mr. Adair, "was born deaf and dumb, and had been a very vicious, loose man. But when it pleased the Lord to work a change on several of that parish of *Larne*, a very sensible change was observed in him, not only in forsaking his former loose courses and

company, but joining himself to religious people, and all the exercises of God's worship in public and private; and ordinarily, morning and evening, used to go alone to prayer, and would weep at sermons, and by such signs those who were acquainted with him understood he would express many things of the work of God upon his heart; so that upon his earnest desire, and by the consent of all the ministers who used to meet at Antrim, he was at last admitted to the ordinance of the Lord's Supper." I am sorry to say that I have not at present in my congregation a single hearer of the name of Brown. I wish I had many, provided they resembled their two namesakes above described.

But whilst internal success thus attended Mr. Dunbar's labours in his congregation, external troubles were gathering around him which finally produced his expulsion from Larne. So early as the year 1626, Bishop Echlin had taken a jealousy against the Presbyterian ministers whom he had admitted into the Church and ordained. In the harvest of 1631, he had suspended from their clerical offices Blair and Livingstone in the County of Down; but "worthy Messrs. Dunbar, Welsh, and others," says Livingstone, "went to Tradeth (Drogheda) to Dr. James Usher, Primate of Armagh, not only a learned but a godly man, although a Bishop (!!), who very carefully dealt for us with the Bishop, so that we were at that time restored." And the Presbyterian ministers went on in their ministry until a letter came from the King to the Lords Justices of Ireland, and was forwarded by them to the Bishop of Down, ordering that Messrs. Dunbar, Blair, Welsh, and Livingstone should be tried and censured for having stirred up the people to ecstasies and enthusiasms; evidently referring to the revival scenes at Larne and elsewhere. Therefore the four ministers above named were cited before the Bishop and urged to conform, and to give their subscription to that effect; but they answered that there was no law or canon in the kingdom there requiring that. But notwithstanding, on May 4, 1632, Blair and Livingstone were deposed, and eight days after Mr. Dunbar and Mr. Welsh, and they continued deposed till May, 1634. For their friend, Archbishop Usher, when again appealed to, said he could do nothing for them, as

the Lords Justices had an order from the King concerning them; and when the Lords Justices were applied to, they referred them to the King, from whom only could remedy be had." Accordingly to the King they determined to appeal, and as Echlin had not read to them what was in the King's letter, "they petitioned," says Livingstone, "that they might be tried in what was informed against them, and if guilty, they refused no punishment—otherwise that for single non-conformity they might, in respect of their Scottish breeding, be forborne in such a barren place as the North of Ireland." (*Livingstone's Life*, p. 17.) To prosecute this appeal on the part of himself, Dunbar, and the others, Blair went to London, with letters in their favour from several of the Scotch nobility, especially his former pupil, Lord Alexander; "and happening," as he says in his *Life*, "to get the King at a distance from his Bishops," he put the petition into his hands, and met with a gracious answer; for he got a letter from the King to the Lord Deputy—Wentworth—ordering that the information should be tried, and if they were free, some favour should be shown them; to which the King added with his own hand, that the matter should be narrowly tried, and seeing he had got from some persons of honour attestations of their innocency, if the information proved false, the informers should be punished." With this favourable answer Blair returned to Ireland, where he was received with great joy by Dunbar and the other brethren; who relying on the sort of half-sanction which the King's letter gave to their ministry, and in the absence of the Lord Deputy, to whom the letter was addressed, went on preaching to their people; only for form's sake, they did not go up to the pulpit, but stood beside the Precentor's desk. At last, "that magnificent Lord" (Strafford) as Blair calls him, having returned to Ireland, Blair, who on this occasion again acted as spokesman for Dunbar and the other ministers, went to Dublin and presented to the Lord Deputy his Majesty's letter, adding that he hoped for a ready compliance with it. But the haughty man, (having, according to Livingstone, got new advertisements from Laud, who guided all church matters at court,) "did altogether slight that order, telling Mr. Blair that he had his Majesty's mind in his

own breast ; reviling the Church of Scotland, and desiring him to come to his right wits, which was all the answer he could get from him." When this intelligence was communicated by Blair to his friend Usher, it drew tears from the good Primate's eyes, but he said he could not help it. However, after a little, the mighty man—Wentworth—from political considerations, became somewhat more propitious towards the Presbyterian ministers of Ulster ; and listening to Lord Castlestuart, their zealous patron, who assured the Deputy that by restoring them to their offices he would gain the affection of all the Scots in the North, he wrote to Echlin in May, 1634, to withdraw for six months his sentence of suspension against them ; which was accordingly done, and in virtue thereof Dunbar, with the other Ministers, was restored to the exercise of his ministry — "at which good news, Mr. Blair," as he himself simply informs us, "was so astonished that he did not sleep for three nights after." But the six months of freedom of speech soon came to an end. As their period of liberty was drawing to a close, Lord Castlestuart applied for, and obtained a prolongation of it for six months more. But Bramhall, Bishop of Derry, (whom the Presbyterians of those days, not without wit and reason, called *a Bramble in their path*,) interfered with the Lord Deputy, who, according to his correspondent's desire, wrote "to my Lord Bishop of Down concerning Mr. Blair, Mr. Dunbar, and those other refractory ministers that refused to conform themselves to the order and discipline of the superior government." The second indulgence being thus withdrawn, and all hopes of further liberty having been cut off, the Presbyterian ministers who were under sentence of suspension—including Mr. Dunbar of Larne—"closed with celebrating the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, and solemnly delivered up their people to the Great Bishop of souls from whom they had received their charge." (*Blair's Life*, p. 82.) To conclude the business, they were, in November, 1634, convened before the Bishop for the third time, and a formal sentence of deposition was pronounced against them, with the exception of Livingstone, who somehow escaped deposition at this time. On this occasion a remarkable conference took place between Blair (of

Bangor,) on the part of the Presbyterian Ministers, and Echlin, Bishop of Down and Connor. The Bishop having desired his Register to read the sentence, added—somewhat superfluously, and with unnecessary cruelty—“But yet, I pray you, appeal from me.” With a spirit worthy of the occasion, and of his descent, the Presbyterian confessor replied;—“Well, then, seeing ye do so much urge upon appeal, I will appeal, indeed. And hereby I do appeal to the tribunal of Christ my Lord, to whom I labour to be faithful, and there I cite you to appear, that ye may answer for your ill deeds of this kind, and for what ye are now going to do.” To which no reply was made, “but the sentence read, the Pastors came away rejoicing in the Lord. But the other citation ere long took effect, the Bishop soon after dying in fearful dumps of conscience.” (*Reid*, i. 185.) Concerning the death of this Bishop Echlin, who thus expelled Mr. Dunbar from his ministry in Larne, Blair in his MS. Life (as quoted by Reid, *ubi supra*,) relates, “Shortly thereafter he sickened, and when the physician, Dr. Maxwell, came to him, and enquired what ailed him, he was long silent, and with great difficulty uttered these words—‘It is my conscience, man.’ To which the Doctor replied, I have no cure for that.”

Bishop Echlin died on the 17th July, 1635. He was succeeded, October 4, 1635, in the Bishopric of Down and Connor, by Henry Leslie, a Scotchman, who had been Dean of Down, and who carried on against the other Presbyterian ministers still remaining in office the work of removal which his predecessor, in the cases already recorded, had begun. In 1636, the roll of the Diocese did not contain the names of any clergymen but those who had signed the canons and formally engaged to yield the required conformity. Even of these, however, many in the seclusion of their parishes continued to use the Presbyterian form of worship to which the people were much attached; and in the case of the deposed Presbyterian ministers, they appear, notwithstanding their deposition, to have ordinarily preached in their own houses. With respect to Blair and Livingstone, who have left records of their lives, this is positively known; and the same was, therefore, in all probability the case

with respect to Mr. Dunbar of Larne. Blair tells us that sometimes they also preached in other houses amongst their friends and acquaintance, and sometimes they did even go into "their churches; and as they had done, when deposed formerly in 1632, so now they prayed with their people, and after one had read a chapter, they discoursed thereon by way of lecture."—*Blair's Life*, p. 85.

But this half liberty soon became intolerable to men, who, whatever else they may have been, certainly always proved themselves to be true born "sons not of the bondwoman but of the free." "Matters," says Blair, "continuing in such a situation as that the deposed ministers had no prospect of being restored, and perceiving no appearance of liberty either to preachers or professors from the bondage of prelacy, they, with a number in the North of Ireland, and a few in Scotland, resolved to transport themselves and their sorrows to New England, in America, where they had large promises of accommodation." Accordingly, they built, at Groomsport, a vessel of about 115 tons, which they piously called "The Eagle Wing," in allusion probably to that passage in Isaiah xl. 31, which declares, that "They who wait upon the Lord shall mount up with wings as eagles;" and in this small vessel they did actually, on the 9th September, 1636, set out from Lough-Fergus to the number of about 140 persons, on their way to freedom and a distant home. Amongst the emigrants are especially mentioned Captain Andrew Agnew, a godly passenger, (whose name suggests the conjecture that he had come from the neighbourhood of Larne,) "and Andrew Brown, the deaf mute from the parish of Larne, already mentioned." Blair and Livingstone were also on board; and each of these faithful ministers has left a narrative of the voyage, which is given by Reid (i. 202,) and which, for simple, heart-touching pathos, comes up to anything I have ever read. The voyage was not successful. The emigrants were beaten back. It was not the will of the Ruler of the elements that they should leave the soil of Ulster, which their descendants continue to infest to this day. Well might their ministers, on their forced return, have used, as the title of their discourses to their people, words which many years afterwards were actually employed

by a Presbyterian minister, on the dispersion of the French fleet,—“*Wind and Weather, a Sermon.*” Philosophers have speculated as to what would have been the modern history of England, if the infatuated Charles had allowed the Great Cromwell to make good his intended escape to America. In Ulster a little speculation might also be allowed as to what would have been the present condition of this Province, if, in 1636, the *Eagle Wing* had succeeded in transporting to America the tender plant of Irish Presbyterianism, which had then scarcely taken root in our Northern soil. Amongst the intending emigrants by the Puritan ship (“*Argo Puritanica*,” as Archdeacon Maxwell sneeringly called her,) the name of Mr. Dunbar, of Larne, does not appear. He had probably returned to Scotland, as, in the year 1638, he was installed minister at Calder, in Lothian, where he died.

[See *Reid's Hist. Pres. Ch.* i. 113—204. *Stewart's MS.*, (*penes me.*) p. 165. *Adair's MS.*, (*penes me.*) pp. 44, 59. *Livingstone's Life*, pp. 16, 17. *Livingstone's Memorable Characteristics*, pp. 22 37. *Blair's Life*, pp. 61—85. *Presbyterian Loyalty*, p. 162. *Rawdon Papers*, p. 15.]

REVIEW.

MIRACLES THE CREDENTIALS OF THE CHRIST: *Five Lectures, delivered in the Church of the Messiah, Birmingham, on Sunday Mornings in January and February, 1863.* By SAMUEL BACHE, Minister of the Congregation. London, Whitfield, 1863. Pp. 90, 12mo.

At length we hear a voice from one of the sister churches in England, raised in vindication of those Christian Scriptures whose authority so many in that land are labouring to deny and set aside,—a voice of power,—a voice that will be heard with respect wherever its tones may penetrate, and they will reach the ears of many; but yet, we trust, only the first of many utterances from the same quarter, and from other quarters, in illustration and defence of the fundamental principles of the holy faith of Christ. While others conceive that they most fittingly

commemorate the self-denying sacrifice offered up to God, conscience, and duty in the days of our Puritan ancestors, by setting on foot a cheap edition of writings calculated to undermine belief in divine revelation, Mr. Bache far more appropriately inaugurates the services of the magnificent church lately erected by his congregation, with an offering at the altar, worthy of himself and of them, and which we trust will be accepted, owned, and blessed by the Great Being in whose temple it is presented.

The title of the volume sufficiently indicates the object which the writer has kept in view. He defines, and, in our opinion, correctly defines, a miracle to be "an immediate and special manifestation of divine power, in attestation of a special messenger from God, and of his special mission." Hence it is not a mere wonder or prodigy, like some of the marvellous stories recorded by Livy and other historians. Miracles are necessarily exceptional: that is, distinct from the ordinary physical modes of the divine operation, which we call laws of nature. By no other means can God either communicate or confirm an express declaration of his will to men: and the probability that miracles will be wrought in attestation of such a messenger is exactly equal to the probability that such a message will be sent. The miracles recorded in the New Testament are therefore to be investigated, not according to the laws of physical science, from which they are confessedly and by their very nature departures, but according to the laws of historical criticism. Now the history which records them is that of the New Testament, especially the Four Gospels; and it deserves notice, that miracles constitute the very texture of those remarkable books. Take the miracles out of the Gospels, and you tear away more than half of the text, while what remains becomes senseless or incredible. The number and variety of these wonderful works, and the circumstances in which they are asserted to have been wrought, are such as tend to confirm our faith in their reality. Moreover, we find that Christianity was introduced and established by the New Testament miracles, in times of high eminence in art, science, and literature, while philosophic speculations were widely diffused, and a spirit of sceptical criticism was very prevalent. We regret that our limits do not permit

us to adduce some specimens of the mode in which Mr. Bache handles these important topics. In the fourth Lecture the principal difficulties and objections which the adversaries to the belief of miracles have suggested, are fairly stated and fairly met. We have seldom seen a more able argument, or one more concisely put. The concluding discourse is on the Religious Significance of Miracles considered in relation to God, to Christ, and to ourselves.—

“At present it is the fashion to treat such inquiries as having no practical importance whatever: and what is the result? The gospel of life and truth and freedom is removed, *by many even of its professed teachers*, out of the region of realities into that of mere fancy and feeling; is classed with the writings of Shakespeare and of other men of distinguished genius, as though no higher inspiration or authority than that of genius were ever possible; and thus every man becomes his own Christ, and maintains his own gospel, *which is precisely what many teachers and professors of religion in these days actually are and do*. They preach themselves, not Christ Jesus the Lord; they serve their hearers, not for Jesus’ sake, but for the sake of themselves acquiring a mean popularity, and of promoting merely transient and temporal objects in lieu of such as are really spiritual and eternal. Not that the Christian, whether teacher or taught, ought ever to neglect those transient and temporal objects which the providence of God invites him to accomplish: but no objects of this kind should ever be treated as supreme and ultimate. They should all of them, even the best and noblest, be always prosecuted in habitual recognition of the principle which St. Paul avows, (2 Cor. iv. 18,) ‘We look, not at the things which are seen, but at the things which are not seen: for the things which are seen are temporal, but the things which are not seen are eternal.’ Hence the great importance to us of the Christian miracles as *realities*, not fables, not figures of speech. They are among the things which are ‘not seen,’ but which may become, by careful investigation, the legitimate objects of a rational, elevating, and lively faith; and when contemplated as realities by such faith, they are clear and sacred attestations to the immediate and special divine origin of Christianity itself, and thus to its distinct and immediate revelation of God and his will, and of our duties and destiny.”

We shall take one more extract from the same admirable discourse:—

“Let us consider the miracles of the Gospel in relation to Christ. They were clearly his *credentials*, to which he himself, and his Apostles after him, continually appealed as proving that he came from God. ‘The works which the Father hath given me to finish, the same works that I do, bear witness of me that the Father hath sent me.’ (John v. 36.) ‘If I do not the works of my Father, believe me not; but if I do, though ye believe not me, believe the

works; that ye may know and believe the Father is in me, and I in him.' (John x. 37, 38.) In like manner the Apostle Peter declares before his countrymen in Jerusalem, 'Jesus of Nazareth, proved unto you to be a man from God, by miracles and wonders and signs which God did through him in the midst of you, as ye yourselves also know.' These were the credentials, then, which proved that Jesus was *from* God, and consequently was not himself God: and these credentials are manifestly in harmony with the office to which he laid claim. He was 'the Christ' of God, not as having been literally 'anointed,' for it was at his baptism that he was announced as the 'beloved Son' of God, not at any ceremony of anointing: but he was 'the Christ'—that is 'the Anointed'—as having been set apart to the high office on which he entered, as kings and priests were set apart by the ceremony of *anointing*, under the first dispensation. That he *was* thus set apart, his miracles abundantly testified: they were the appropriate credentials by which it was attested. They who deny the miracles must, in all consistency, reject the Christ; for the office is just as special as its credentials."

We trust this little volume, so useful in its nature and so seasonable in the time of its appearance, will meet with an extensive sale. We can recommend it as eminently worthy of a thoughtful perusal. Indeed we know of few publications of the same size better calculated to do good to a numerous class of inquirers, whose minds have been disturbed by the perverse efforts of those who are labouring to upset the faith of Christians.

THE PRESBYTERY OF ANTRIM AND ITS ELDER.

OUR readers are familiar with the fact that, on the 29th of December last, Dr. Montgomery delivered at Carrickfergus a speech which contained the following passage:—"I happen to have in my pocket . . . a statement of an Elder of the Presbytery of Antrim—rather a distinguished Elder. . . . He says, 'It was our design to build up a Church which should not be exclusively Christian *in any sense*, which would admit Christians, Deists, Pantheists, Hindoos, and Mahometans.' The person to whom this was said inquired 'whether they would exclude Atheists?' He replied that '*Atheists would not be excluded*;' . . . 'and even if a minister became an Atheist,' this Elder thought 'he should not be required to resign.'"

This speech was duly reported in *The Belfast News-Letter* of the 30th December, 1862. It has been quoted and commented on by the Rev. J. Scott Porter in the Appendix to his lecture on the New Theology, and by various writers at different times in the pages of this periodical. It must have been well known to every member of the Presbytery of Antrim; yet, *till this hour, neither that Presbytery, in its collective capacity, nor any one of its elders*, has thought fit to take the slightest notice of a statement attributing to the Body a design to build up a Church which should not be exclusively Christian in any sense! However, it appears that the Rev. S. C. Nelson, on the 9th of April, (*but not till then*,) wrote to the Rev. Charles J. M'Alester, requesting to be favoured with the name of the Elder referred to, and the occasion on which the observations were made, and that subsequently he applied to the Rev. Dr. Montgomery and to the Rev. J. Scott Porter, preferring the same request. It was refused, as he doubtless expected it would be, on the ground that, as Mr. Nelson neither was an Elder nor had been commissioned by his Presbytery to make the inquiry, he had no claim whatever to the information which he demanded, nor any right to intermeddle in the matter.

However, he has since thought proper to publish the answers which he received to his self-authorized communications, accompanied by several remarks from his own pen, or that some of zealous adherent, under the title of "*A Calumny Exposed*." His publication affords an opportunity of giving to the world a full statement, shewing—(1) Who is the "rather distinguished elder," who has ascribed to the Presbytery of Antrim the "design" above set forth, as well as the occasion on which his observations were made, and the considerations which may have withheld the Presbytery from taking any official cognizance of the statement; (2) The reasons by which Mr. Nelson was probably influenced in deferring *his* notice of the circumstance till the 9th of April, 1863—*upwards of three months after the publication of the speech of Dr. Montgomery*; and (3) What is the calumny, and who are the calumniators, in this matter.

But as there is not room for such a statement in the

present number of *The Christian Unitarian*, it is necessarily held over till next month, when, if life and health be spared, it shall appear at full length.

INTELLIGENCE.

AMERICAN UNITARIAN ASSOCIATION.

THE annual meeting of this Association was held in the new and spacious Church in Arlington-street, Boston, on June 2nd. A meeting for business was held at nine o'clock, A.M., at which the treasurer's report was submitted: the total income for the past year was 15,492 dollars, and the outlay 15,953 dollars. The income was 4000 dollars more than that for the previous year. The public meeting held at ten o'clock, A.M., is reported to have been one of the most interesting and successful meetings of the denomination. The spacious and elegant church was filled in every part. After prayer by the Rev. Dr. Hill, of Worcester, and an anthem by the choir, the annual report was read by the secretary of the board, Mr. George W. Fox. It alluded in detail to the various departments of enterprise which the Association has either established or maintained during the past eleven months. Speaking of the Indian mission, it was said that the increased rate of exchange would require an increase of contributions. The war would probably cause some increase of the number of feeble parishes; many able men were drawn away to perish in the field, whose places could not be supplied for years. The Association had given away two thousand three hundred and seven bound volumes of books in the year: some of these went for hospital libraries. Of the series of tracts, nineteen thousand five hundred had been distributed, more than half in the army; and from the army fund no less than one hundred and thirteen thousand tracts had been furnished. The interests of the Association were represented as in a flourishing state, the membership of the body increasing, and the contributions in its support exceeding those of the year preceding by more than three thousand dollars. The Rev. Dr. Stebbins, president of the Association, then made an introductory and congratulatory address, in which he dwelt on the lesson of the hour, the full and overflowing charity, and the patriotic self-sacrifice so prevalent in this war all over the land. He next welcomed the Association to the new and beautiful temple of their faith in which they were then assembled. And, finally, he congratulated the audience on the spread of liberal sentiments throughout the world, and the peculiar aim and office of liberal Christianity. Several other ministers addressed the meeting. Mr. Scandlin, missionary to the army of the Potomac, gave an interesting account of the scenes he had visited in the army. The Rev. Dr. Bellows was the last speaker. His particular

theme was the good which is being done in the North by this contest, in awakening and stimulating to a more vigorous life our practical Christian virtues.

Among the addresses delivered was one by the Rev. Dr. Hedge, the point of which was to shew "that Unitarians are not, and, as a sect, should not be propagandists, nor any longer even defenders of liberal thought. The Jesuitism of events (?) is doing all and more than we could do. Science and literature are our grand, natural, and sufficient allies, and we have no need to be troubled about the spread of liberal Christian faith." The editor of the *New York Christian Inquirer* says, the illustration of this topic was "most pertinent and conclusive." It is a pity that the argument by which the speaker's position was reached was not given to us. For ourselves we rather incline to think that both Dr. Hedge and the Editor of *The Christian Inquirer* are gentlemen who live in their studies, and seldom bestow a glance on what is passing outside of their libraries. A little practical intimacy with the great world out of doors would soon disabuse them of the notion that there is no occasion for exertions to propagate a liberal Christian faith, or that Unitarians are over-earnest and unnecessarily zealous in their efforts for the purpose. Or, if the case be as they would have us believe in America, we can assure them it is quite otherwise on this side of the Atlantic. We remark that the next speaker, the Rev. Robert Collyer, of Chicago, maintained that "at least, *out West*, there is a demand for special organized action on the part of the Unitarian body." In the valley which is watered by the Mississippi and its tributaries, there are 9,000,000 of inhabitants, for whom there are just sixteen Unitarian preachers; "and his earnest avowal of a desire to see this immense harvest turned to account, was greeted with irrepressible applause from the congregation." *The Christian Inquirer* admits that, although "Mr. Collyer had a hard task set him, to restore the balance of a missionary spirit, after the address of Dr. Hedge, he did his work admirably, and carried the sympathies of the audience with him."

TORONTO, CANADA WEST.

The completion of the basement story of the Unitarian Church of Toronto, for Sabbath School purposes, was celebrated on the evening of Thursday, 16th July, by a soiree. The attendance was numerous, and the whole proceedings were marked by cheerfulness. All enjoyed the pleasant reunion, and were delighted with the entertainments of the evening. After tea, which was served in excellent style by the ladies, several appropriate sentiments were introduced; and the choir, under the leadership of Mr. Reynolds, and assisted by some friends from neighbouring Churches, sang a number of anthems and duets in most excellent style.

CONFERENCE OF AMERICAN UNITARIAN MINISTERS.

On Monday, the 13th of July, a meeting of Unitarian ministers was held in the Arlington Street Chapel, Boston, at which Dr. Gannett delivered "a carefully thought out and carefully composed

address, containing a statement of the proper studies and habits of our clergy from the author's point of view." What that point of view is, our readers, or such of them as did not know it before, will learn from the first article in this month's *Christian Unitarian*. "It started a very animated and interesting discussion, quite in the tone of our recent debates, which mingle so much diversity of feeling with brotherly kindness." It would be delightful to find a little of the same tone introduced into other ministerial meetings, where it is sadly wanted.

OBITUARY.

Died, after a short illness, at Richmond Lodge, near Belfast, on Wednesday, the 24th of June, 1863, Sara, daughter of the late John Dunville, Esq.; a truly pious and amiable lady, whose removal will be long and deeply regretted not merely by her family, but by the poor of her neighbourhood, and by the social circle of which she was a bright ornament. We understand that she has bequeathed to several charitable institutions, of which she was throughout life a generous benefactress, tokens of her continued interest in their prosperity.

Died, at Hillsborough, July 24, Mary Ann, last surviving daughter of the late Rev. John Mulligan, Moira.

Died, on Monday, the 27th of July, 1863, at Aberystwith, in Wales, to which he had withdrawn in consequence of failing health, John Wellington Stoupe M'Cance, Esq., J.P., third son of the late John M'Cance, Esq., of Suffolk, near Dunmurry. He emulated the virtues of his lamented father, whose kindness of heart he inherited. As a Magistrate, as first Deputy Chairman, and afterwards Chairman of the Board of Guardians of the Belfast Union, and latterly as one of the Directors of the Ulster Banking Company, his services to the public were invaluable, while his social qualities endeared him to all who enjoyed the pleasure of his friendship and acquaintance in private life. In him the Remonstrant Congregation of Dunmurry has lost one of its most devout members and liberal supporters. He was a stranger to bigotry and intolerance, but he had clear views of religious truth, and manfully avowed and maintained them on all suitable occasions.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

Some Articles are unavoidably postponed.

ERRATUM.—In p. 263, *note*, for *Worcester's*, read *Webster's English Dictionary*.

Communications for the Editor, to be addressed by post to Rev. C. J. M'Alester, Holywood; or, otherwise, to 45, Arthur Street, Belfast.

Orders for the work and business communications to be sent to the Agent of the Unitarian Society, 45, Arthur Street.

THE
CHRISTIAN UNITARIAN.

VOL. II.]

OCTOBER, 1863.

[No. 9.

NON-SUBSCRIBER—ITS ORIGINAL MEANING.

RECENT occurrences make it desirable to recur for a little to this subject, in order to furnish a more correct statement of the import of this word as it was originally used in the great controversy from which it took its rise. For it is reported, we hope not truly, that the Master of the Rolls pronounced a "dictum" that "a man's answering set questions was subscription to a creed, and in principle directly opposed to that on which the Presbytery of Antrim was unquestionably formed." We say that we cannot think that the Master of the Rolls could have pronounced a decision so inconsistent with every principle on which the meaning of words should be determined; because we know that if any document in dispute, whether will, contract, deed, or any other, contained within itself a clear and precise explanation or definition of any leading term, he would admit that such meaning, and no other, should be considered as correct and binding upon the parties concerned.

This course is precisely what we maintain should be followed in this case. We have an authority for the meaning of the terms "Non-Subscribers," "Non-Subscription"—as used by the parties themselves—that is unquestionable. There is a document in existence, and well known, that was published by the "Ministers of the Presbytery of Antrim," and authenticated by the signature of Samuel Haliday, as Moderator, and Michael Bruce, as Clerk. It is called "A Narrative of the Proceedings of Seven General Synods of the Northern Presbyterians in Ireland, with relation to their differences in judgment and practice from the year 1720 to the year 1726, in which they issued in a Synodical Breach," &c.

Now, their own account of the "occasion, rise," and meaning of the term is this—"Those ministers who did not think fit to comply with the Voluntary Subscription, were from that time called Non-Subscribers, and all who complied with it, either at that time or afterwards, in their presbyteries, pass under the denomination of Subscribers." This expression, "Voluntary Subscription," refers to the Synod's resolution "to allow such *as were willing, to subscribe the Westminster Confession of Faith*, according to the terms of the Pacific Act."

This was the origin of the appellation as applied to those ministers in the different presbyteries that refused to subscribe agreeably to this resolution of the Synod. These were afterwards removed out of their several presbyteries, and formed into a separate presbytery called the Presbytery of Antrim, of which this henceforth became the distinguishing principle.

Throughout all the debates connected with this controversy, the Subscribers were those who maintained that the Synod had a right to require subscription from its members to the *Westminster Confession of Faith*, whenever they chose to order it. The Non-Subscribers were those who refused to allow the Synod this "inquisitorial" power over its members, and further refused to require subscription to this Confession as a term of communion from intrants, or from candidates for ordination. Nor was there ever any change in this usage of the terms in their subsequent history, and, in particular, the same principle was re-asserted in that statement of the history and principles of the Presbytery of Antrim that was published as an Appendix to the edition of "Towgood's Dissenting Gentleman's Letters," printed in Newry in 1816, and adopted by an unanimous resolution of the Presbytery at the time. It is in these words—"The difference [between the General Synod and the Presbytery of Antrim] arose from the refusal of some of the ministers to subscribe the *Westminster Confession of Faith*;" and again, "These discontents [between the General Synod and Presbytery of Antrim] continued till the year 1725, when the Non-Subscribing brethren were united in one presbytery called the Presbytery of Antrim, and recognised as a Non-Subscribing presbytery."

We could easily multiply quotations in illustration of this usage, for they occur in almost every page; but we have surely given enough to show the meaning of the term, both in common sense and in legal parlance; sufficient also as an answer to malicious threats that have been thrown out of litigating our property and rights, proving them to be as futile as they are malicious.

The Presbytery of Antrim was the only body to whom the name "Non-Subscriber" properly applied. The English Dissenters were called Non-Conformists from an early date; but this term was more particularly applied to those who refused to conform to the requirements of the Act of Uniformity in the time of Charles II. In the Episcopal or Established Church, subscription was, and is, peremptorily required to the Three Articles of the 36th Canon, including their assent to everything in the Book of Common Prayer and the Thirty-nine Articles; but there could be no Non-Subscribing Body in the Church, whatever their opinions might be, because no one could be received until he had subscribed, and if he subsequently *omitted* to use the form of prayer or any of the orders or ceremonies prescribed in the Communion Book, he was to be suspended; if he did not submit himself after a month, he was to be excommunicated, and, after another month's resistance, he was to be deposed from the ministry. This effectually prevented the assumption of any name by those who were dissatisfied with these stringent measures, although they advocated the cause of Christian Liberty by such publications as the "Confessional," "Free and Candid Disquisitions," and the "Feathers' Tavern Petition."

Among ourselves, in about a century after the expulsion of the Presbytery of Antrim, the Remonstrants, who took their name from the remonstrance that they presented against the Overtures of the Synod, separated from that Body, but could not be called "Non-Subscribers," for, by adopting the Code of Discipline, they sanctioned a qualified subscription.

The Southern Association, afterwards called the Synod of Munster, existed prior to this expulsion, and, though they sympathized with the Non-Subscribing party, they

had no occasion to adopt the name, being simply an offset from the Non-Conformists of England.

In 1835 these three bodies agreed to form one United Association. In deliberating about a distinctive appellation, it was obvious that they could not be called Non-Conformists, for the large majority were Northern Presbyterians, who had no direct connection with English Non-Conformists; nor Remonstrants, as there was no remonstrance required, nor any body to remonstrate with. They finally agreed to adopt the name "Irish Non-Subscribing Presbyterians," as, though there was no subscription required, they all agreed in the principle conveyed by this word. Their bond of union was not Non-Subscription, but was expressed in these words prior to assuming any name: "That whereas the Synod of Munster, the Presbytery of Antrim, and the Remonstrant Synod of Ulster, are perfectly unanimous in acknowledging allegiance to the Lord Jesus Christ, as the only King and Head of the Church, and in the maintenance of the great principles of the Reformation, viz., the Sufficiency of the Scriptures, the right of Private Judgment, and the rejection of Human Authority in matters of Faith, they do agree to unite, under the denomination of "The Association of Irish Non-Subscribing Presbyterians."

After several other resolutions, it was moved by the Rev. W. Bruce, and seconded by the Rev. Robert Ferris, and unanimously resolved—"That nothing in the above resolutions, or in the union of the Three Bodies to carry those resolutions into effect, shall be considered as in the slightest degree interfering with the independence, name, or separate jurisdiction of the Synod of Munster, the Presbytery of Antrim, or the Remonstrant Synod of Ulster."

The purport of the distinguishing epithet adopted by the Presbytery of Antrim is clear and unquestionable; but this was merely negative, and did not convey any knowledge of their religious principles. These were contained in the Six Propositions that have been so often quoted and referred to. As we have not room for printing these propositions, we give from the same authentic source the following as a summary:—"They (the Non-

Subscribers) declared their principles by their professing the Christian Religion and acknowledging the Scriptures to be the only and a perfect rule of that religion; by choosing as to their stated communion to associate with Christians of the denomination of Presbyterians; that at their ordination they had *made a profession of their principles* satisfactory to the churches that chose them to be their pastors, and *to their ordainers*, which profession they had never retracted nor contradicted."

These were the principles of our predecessors, which we adopt, not because they were theirs, but because they are true and essential, but which the residuary Presbytery of Antrim, with their recent accretions, virtually repudiate, because they require no profession of the Christian religion, and no profession of their principles satisfactory to their ordainers.

We have hitherto adverted only to that part of the decision attributed to the Master of the Rolls, that concerns the "principle on which the Presbytery of Antrim was unquestionably formed," and we think we have shown this to be an unquestionable mistake. We must now say a few words on the other part, viz., "That a man's answering to set questions was subscription to a creed," premising, that "answering set questions," or indeed any questions at all, is not necessary for the object that the Presbytery had always in view—the faithful discharge of the trust reposed in them of ascertaining and certifying the qualifications of an intrant into the ministry before they pledged their sanction to his appointment to the important office of ministering to a Christian congregation in the offices of public worship, the ordinances of religion, or the other duties that a minister of the Gospel has to discharge. And, in premising this, we do not mean to impugn the propriety of proceeding by set questions as the Remonstrant Synod does, but simply that as the Presbytery of Antrim was alone contemplated in the observation, it is right that the matter should be stated correctly; for there is nothing to prevent our accepting a spontaneous statement of religious views that may be satisfactory to the Congregation and ourselves. We say, then, that to answer questions, set or unset, is not equivalent to subscribing a creed, much

less to subscribing the *Westminster Confession of Faith*. We may take as our example the questions in the Remonstrant Code. The first is—Do you believe in God the Creator and Governor of the universe? The person asked is at perfect liberty to say yes or no, or that he has not made up his mind, or that he is a Pantheist.

In the same way as to the second question—Do you believe that the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament contain a Divine Revelation? He is at the same liberty as to his answer. He may admit, or he may deny, the authenticity, genuineness, and truth of the Scriptures. And as to the third question—Do you believe in the Divine Mission and authority of the Lord Jesus Christ as the Son of God and Saviour of the world? He may assent or dissent. He may say that he believes with Professor Paulus, of Heidelberg, who attempted to explain all the miracles as narratives of ordinary events, or with Dr. Strauss, that the whole history of our Lord is mythic [which is an euphony for “fabulous”]—a kind of imaginative amplification of certain vague and slender traditions.

It will be said, he may do so, but if he answer in the negative the congregation must have the option of adhering to their call or not. If they agree with the “Elder of the Presbytery of Antrim” that Atheists should not be excluded from their pulpits, and that they will have him for their minister, the Presbytery will then have to say whether they will ordain him on this profession, whether they would admit him into their Body, or, in ecclesiastical language, hold communion with him. If they determine that it would be utter faithlessness to their trust to do so, the congregation will be at perfect liberty to leave the connexion and join themselves to any other body.

In fine, we are bound, by our complete concurrence with the principles of the early founders of the Presbytery, to deny that “we have any power from Jesus Christ to add any other terms of religious communion to those He hath settled in the Gospel.” This was their fundamental principle, and it is ours. But we are also bound not to admit those whom Christ and his Apostles would not have admitted. And we cannot conceive that Christ would have received any one that scrupled to avow his

belief in God his Father, or that the Apostles would have received any that would not believe in their heart, and confess with their mouth, the Lord Jesus, or that would hesitate to profess that to us there is one God the Father, and one Lord Jesus Christ. There may be other terms of communion as expressly stated in Scripture, but we are satisfied with these, because, if sincerely professed, they imply the others. We believe, with the Apostle Paul, that "other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ."

The only principle on which congregations could rest satisfied without such a declaration of religious belief, is the presumption that none would wish to enter the ministry without feeling it. But does the statement in our last number, in the article, "Who are to be our Ministers?" justify such presumption, or make it safe to be indifferent about the matter?

We subjoin an extract from the "Rule of Faith," by Archbishop Tillotson. He was of Puritan extraction, but reached the highest dignity in the Established Church, being made Archbishop of Canterbury by William III., with whom he was a special favourite. He was distinguished by his eloquence as a preacher and his liberality as a divine. He died in 1694. His sermons were in general circulation before the times of the Salters' Hall and Synodical debates, and, though now become antiquated, were long in much repute with the liberal denomination, and may have had much influence in originating those liberal views. The "Rule of Faith" had especial reference to the Roman Catholic controversy; but the following extract so correctly states the principles of the early Presbytery of Antrim, that it might be thought to have been written for that purpose:—

"A Rule of Faith is the measure according to which we are to judge what matters we are to assent to, as revealed to us by God, and what not. And more particularly the Rule of Christian Faith is the measure according to which we are to judge what we ought to assent to as the doctrine revealed by Christ to the world and what not.

"So that this question, What is the Rule of Christian Faith? supposeth a doctrine revealed by Christ to the world; and that that doctrine was intelligibly and entirely delivered by Christ to his apostles, and sufficient confirmation given to it; that this doctrine was in the same manner published to the world by the

apostles, who likewise gave sufficient evidence of the truth of it. All this is necessarily supposed in the question: for it would be in vain to inquire whether this or that be the Rule of Christian Faith, if such a thing as the Christian Faith were not first supposed. When, therefore, we inquire what is the Rule of Christian Faith, the meaning of that inquiry is, by what way and means the knowledge of Christ's doctrine is conveyed certainly down to us who live at the distance of so many ages from the time of its first delivery. For this being known we have the Rule of Faith, that is, a measure by which we may judge what we are to assent to as the doctrine of Christ and what not. So that when any question ariseth about any particular proposition, whether this be part of Christ's doctrine, we may by this Rule so resolve it.—*Tillotson*, Vol. i., p. 530.

CONGREGATIONAL MEMOIRS.

No. II.—LARNE AND KILWAUGHTER.

(*Continued from p. 281.*)

A.D. 1637 to 1646, vacant.

Between the final departure of Mr. Dunbar from Larne, which probably took place in 1637, and the settlement there of Mr. Thomas Hall in 1646, many events of great importance to the Ulster Presbyterians occurred. To these, however, I can in general allude, on this occasion, only in so far as they locally concern the Parish of Larne, and must refer the reader, for the general history of the period, to the valuable work of Dr. Reid. But, as a conclusion to the romantic narrative of the voyage of "The Eagle Wing," noticed in my last paper, I may be allowed to quote the following passage from the Adair MS. :—

"After the ministers came back to Carigfergus Lough, and laid aside their design of America, some had compassion on them; yet the bishops shewed no mercy to them, when wearied with a long and dangerous voyage, and wasted in their bodies, spirits, and estates, but grew more violent in their persecution, not only of them, but of those left behind, both ministers and people. So now it was not summoning to the Courts, and taking a little money from the people for their non-conformity, nor deposing ministers, but they proceeded to excommunication of all who would not come up to their plan, upon which they obtained writs *de excommunicato capiendo* for those excommunicated, both ministers and people, and pursuivants were sent down to apprehend them, and many people were taken and imprisoned. Yet through God's special providence the ministers escaped to Scotland, and some of them very narrowly,

and by singular stratagems of providence, even when they were upon the water in their enemies' hands. And after the ministers, many of the people followed to Scotland with what small stocks they had, and lived sparingly upon them as strangers in the land (though their native land) till God should give an outgate."

In addition to the persons who, at this period, thus left Ulster for a time, and made a temporary settlement in Scotland, there were many others who visited their mother country occasionally, for the pious purpose of receiving there the acceptable spiritual nourishment which was denied to them in the land of their adoption. Amongst these, the people of Larne, from their local position so near Scotland, were singularly favourably situated for this "cross-channel" communication, and, I doubt not, that they duly availed themselves of the opportunity. Livingstone, when driven out of Killinchy, was settled at Stranraer, on Lough-Ryan, immediately opposite to Larne; and, although in the times of which we now speak, the communication between Larne and Stranraer was certainly not so regular and expeditious as it is at present, yet Livingstone tells us that "out of Ireland" (and, I doubt not, out of Larne in particular, which was almost within sight of Stranraer), "some of our friends came to Stranraer, and at the communions twice in the year great numbers used to come, at one time 500 persons. At one time I baptized 28 children brought out of Ireland." Blair also mentions the same fact. But the visitors from Ireland attended at other periods besides communions. Livingstone thus acknowledges his obligation to them, on occasion of a charity sermon in Stranraer. After mentioning the account of the collection, he says—

"The reason that we got so much was that there were sundry families of Irish people dwelling in the town. One Margaret Jane, the wife of William Scot, a malt-man, who had fled out of Ireland, and was but in a mean condition, gave seven twenty-two shilling pieces, and an eleven pound piece. When, the day after, I enquired of her how she gave so much, she said, 'I was gathering, and had laid up this to be a portion to a young daughter I had; and as the Lord hath lately been pleased to take my daughter to himself, I thought I would give him her portion also.'"

In the meantime, this frequent communication between Ireland and Scotland began to give uneasiness to the au-

thorities in the former country. They seem to have apprehended that the Scotch had some intention of returning the visits of their Irish friends, and *that* not for the peaceful purpose of attending a communion or a charity sermon. In the Spring of 1639, the Irish Government were alarmed by reports of a midnight invasion of Ulster by the Covenanters from Scotland, in order to help their friends in this country, who were greatly oppressed by the Lord Deputy Strafford. "They, therefore," says Adair, "sent forth certain persons as spies, under pretence of friends to Non-Conformists. However, the Lord ordered so as most were upon their guard, and none found prejudice that way, except one Trueman, who was trepanned at Lairn, and brought to Carrickfergus, there tried, and condemned, and executed as a traitor." As Larne is specially mentioned in this affair, I may add, on the authority of a MS. quoted by M'Skimin in *Larne Journal*, March, 1839, that Trueman had engaged a Captain Giles to go into Scotland with a letter, as an agent to promote the cause of the Covenanters; but Giles betrayed his employer, who was at once apprehended, as were also two other men called Blair and Finlay. In his speech on the scaffold at Carrickfergus, Trueman exposed the treachery of Giles, and, pointing to Scotland, declared that his death would yet be avenged. He was hanged, drawn, and quartered, and his head placed on a pole on the top of the castle, and his body, cut into quarters, was hung over the four gates of the town. Blair and Finlay were liberated without a trial.* The dread of this Scottish invasion of Ulster

* M'Skimin, in his *History of Carrickfergus*, p. 41, adds the following particulars:—"Respecting this affair, which even Strafford in his letter to Secretary Coke calls 'foolish,' and 'extreme vain,' Sir John Clotworthy, afterwards Earl of Massereene, made the following deposition on the trial of the Earl of Strafford:—That one Trueman, an Englishman, who dwelt near Carrickfergus, was sent about the country to find out who were attached to the Scots; that he spake with one Captain Giles, who feigned himself a great friend to the Scottish nation; hence he discoursed with Trueman, who was but a silly fellow, and got from him words whereby he discovered a good will to the Scottish nation, and some discourse about the Castle of Carrickfergus, and at length he got Trueman's letter to recommend him into Scotland, whither he pretended a desire to go to serve under their command. But Giles produced this letter on Trueman's trial, who, a few days afterwards suffered death." (See also Reid, Vol. i. 245, note.)

continued till the following year; for in the Summer of 1640, the army which Strafford had raised, and which consisted almost entirely of Roman Catholic troops, was, as a precautionary measure, quartered in the neighbourhood of Larne. Here they employed themselves in raising a fort of earth at Olderfleet Castle, on the Corran, to preserve the shipping in the harbour of Larne, and constructing an encampment with trenches and parapets, in order that, when called on actual service, they might be experienced in the formation of such temporary fortifications (*Reid*, i. 294). Of these works some traces remain to the present day. Lord Antrim, who commanded these forces, had asked for a supply of arms and a magazine; but the more prudent Strafford "held it unsafe any store of arms should lye so near the great Scottish plantations in these parts, lest they might chance to borrow those weapons of his Lordship for a longer time and another purpose than his Lordship would find cause to thank them for," adding, "they are shrewd children, not much won by courtship, especially from a Roman Catholic." Of this feature of Ulster Presbyterianism many traces remain to the present day, and I trust will long continue.

In the following year, 1641, the Congregation of Larne and Kilwaughter supplied a defender for the Protestants of the town and neighbourhood of Larne. In the original depositions respecting this period, which are preserved in the library of Trinity College, Dublin, it is stated that "the town of Larne, remote from any large body of the insurgents, was maintained and fortified by the inhabitants of the adjoining districts, under the command of CAPTAIN AGNEW."

To quell the insurrection of 1641, came the Scottish army of Major General Robert Munro, which reached Carrickfergus in April, 1642. This army was attended by its Presbyterian Chaplains, amongst whom came Livingstone, formerly of Killinchy, who was attached to Sir John Clotworthy's regiment; and he tells us that in addition to staying and preaching six weeks in Carrickfergus, and other six weeks in Antrim, he also preached sometimes "in other parishes of the coast side about;" and I have no doubt that Larne partook in the benefit

of his services. At any rate, Larne is mentioned by Adair amongst "the Congregations which were first in a case for Elderships," and to whom ministers were therefore sent at this time as occasional supplies, by the military presbytery which was organized in Carrickfergus, June 10, 1642, "and the Elderships being erected in these places, there began a little appearance of a formed church in this country." We may also believe that the district of Larne and Kilwaughter was not overlooked in the arrangements which, between the years 1642 and 1646 were made by the Church of Scotland, in compliance with the request of Commissioners from Ireland, for the supply of Presbyterian ordinances to the people of this province. At length, in the latter year, "Rev. Archibald Ferguson, of Antrim, and Mr. John Edmonstone, of Ballybantrim, in Broadisland, having been sent as a fifth Commission from Ireland to the General Assembly of Scotland, for a supply of ministers to be sent, the Assembly, although they declined to deal with any placed ministers to give up their present congregations, yet induced several young men to accept calls from Ireland; and amongst those who came over at this time was

II.—THOMAS HALL, second minister of Larne (1646—1695). Respecting the history of Mr. Hall previously to his arrival in Ireland, or even the place of his birth and residence in Scotland, I have not been able to ascertain any particulars. When he came to Larne, he must have been, according to the inscription on his tombstone, about 26 years of age. He was, therefore, like the other ministers who came over from Scotland at this time, young and inexperienced. But the Presbytery in Ireland did not neglect to take precautions with respect to the characters of the "expectants" who were then coming over from Scotland. Adair says—

"They made an act that the young men should have sufficient testimonials; should converse with the most judicious and godly in the places they were called unto, and entertain conference with them; should sometimes preach in other parishes, and converse with good people there; and that private letters should be written by friends here to ministers and other godly persons in Scotland concerning their conversation while they were there. They also took trials of these young men, according to the manner used in

the Church of Scotland, and thereafter settled them in their respective parishes, upon the people's supplication to the Presbytery and call to the same."

And even after their settlement the work of supervision was not remitted, for

"An act was made that once or twice a year the members of the Presbytery undergo an admonition or censure of their brethren, if need require it, as to any part of their carriage, whether in the Presbytery or otherwise, or in the discharge of their ministry, known to any of their brethren; and that for that end, one or two at once shall be removed till the rest consider what ground there is to admonish, censure, or encourage them; and so by degrees they shall be removed, and their carriage considered by the rest, till the whole members (especially the ministers) receive the mind of the rest. This was thought a fit means of keeping the brethren more watchful in their conversing with their brethren and their congregations, and otherwise, and to keep up the authority of the Presbytery over particular brethren."

Whether this old-fashioned Presbyterial practice of mutual examination and edification* could, with propriety, be revived in the present day, I do not stop to consider. In some cases it *might* be attended with inconvenient results. But there is no doubt that, in the times of which we now speak, it was productive of unmitigated good. With respect to the Church, Adair tells us that

"It was a wonder to all beholders to see how, in the case of these young men not attained to maturity of judgment, nor having had any experience in the government of the Church, especially in the midst of difficulties, and none of the old stock who had been there before being settled amongst them, God helped these young men into a diligent following of their duty, not only in their own congregations where they did reside, but in watering desolate congregations in the country."

And with respect to these young men themselves,

"They were seen minding their work and delighting therein, mutually comforting themselves in the company of one another at their meetings in the Presbytery, and not considering their present toil but with a kind of honest delight."

Oh fortunatos nimium! oh, si sic semper!!

In the case of Mr. Thomas Hall of Larne, wisdom was justified of her child. He rose to a position of considerable eminence amongst his brethren, and during a

* For an account of the form of procedure at these "privy censures," as they were called, taken from Stewart of Purdovan's Collections, see Reid, Vol. ii., p. 143.

long and troubled ministry in Larne of forty-nine years, he maintained a reputation of unblemished purity and truth. He is spoken of by the author of "Presbyterian Loyalty" as "man of profound learning, great abilities, and piety." So early as 1649, he was sent over to Scotland, as a Commissioner from the Presbytery meeting in Carrickfergus, to consult the parent Church on an important point of discipline which had arisen in the Route of the County Antrim. In 1658, he was one of three ministers from Ulster who were appointed to manage a very delicate conference with Henry Cromwell in Dublin; and in 1690, five years before his death, the venerable man was Moderator of the General Synod held in Belfast, then adding to his other admirable qualities the gift of a long experience. To counterbalance these honours, Mr. Hall shared largely in the troubles which, during the course of his lengthened ministry, befel the Irish Presbyterians. These troubles came to them almost equally from King and Commonwealth. In the case of Mr. Hall, one effect of them was to cause his occasional absence from Larne, at various periods of longer and shorter duration. I am inclined to think that he was absent from his parish during the whole of the years 1651, 1652, and 1653. In 1663 also he was obliged to fly to Scotland, but he soon returned. In 1651, his name is not mentioned by Adair amongst the ministers—"being about six or seven only"—who remained in the country, or if he was in Ireland at that time, he was confined in Carrickfergus Castle; and on November 2, 1653, he was certainly in Scotland, for his name is recorded as attending a meeting on that day of "ministers from Ireland" at Maybole. On this latter occasion, he and his brethren are spoken of as having been banished from Ireland "for their loyalty." Very shortly afterwards, however, the Irish ministers began to return from Scotland; and doubtless Mr. Hall about that time came back to his charge in Larne. But if a notable plan devised by the Parliamentary Commissioners of the period had been carried out, he would, on his return to Ireland, have found his congregational charge greatly reduced. It was in 1653 that the scheme for transporting the Ulster Presbyterians to Tipperary was devised; and as, on the list for the Barony of Glenarm of the persons whom it

was intended thus to transport, appear several of the name of AGNEW, who doubtless would have taken their tenants with them, the accomplishment of this scheme would certainly have seriously reduced the number of attendants on Mr. Hall's ministry in Larne. But it was not so ordered.

In 1661, Mr. Hall of Larne, like the other faithful Presbyterian ministers of the day, was ejected from his Church and parish by the Act of Uniformity, as enforced by Jeremy Taylor, Bishop of Down and Connor. Whilst recording this fact in the life of my predecessor, I may be allowed to say a few words on a subject in which Mr. Hall himself was deeply concerned, and which is also not without its interest to his successor; I mean his "maintenance" during his ministry in Larne. On his settlement here, in 1646, he undoubtedly had the tithes of the parish, for Adair expressly states that "the Commissioners of the Parliament of England at that time did give a right of the tithe of parishes to as many of the new intrants as applied to them;"* but this state of things did not continue long under the Parliamentary Government. In 1654 Adair mentions that "the ministers had no settled maintenance, nothing being allowed them now for full five years, except what the people, under the burthens and oppressions of strangers, could spare them. And for new intrants, though the Presbytery obtained some better conditions for them from the parishes that called them, than they got for themselves who had been called before; yet the conditions were but small, and scarcely in most places able to give any comfortable subsistence." In 1655 the ministers, principally through the good offices of Sir John Clotworthy, procured from Fleetwood "a maintenance by salary," which they accepted. "Although they saw it inconvenient to pass from their legal maintenance (*i.e.*, by tithes), and it was much contrary to their inclination to have any dependence on an usurping power;" yet wisely considering that "it was necessary that ministers should be maintained," and per-

* "This was no more than merely reinstating them, for so early as the reign of James I. they enjoyed both churches and tithes without their using the Church Liturgy, with the same privilege as the rest of the *Established Clergy*."—*Leland's History of Ireland*, Vol. ii.

haps keenly remembering the previous results of the voluntary system, and dreading a repetition of them amongst "a people who were not able to bear further burden," and also reflecting that "in what they got from the Treasury they but got their own again, and a maintenance out of the tithes which was the due of ministers," they closed with the proposal. In the following year, 1656, the amiable Henry Cromwell, "coming over with his father's instructions for moderation for all who professed the Protestant religion, and having a chaplain (Francis Roberts) in his company who was then a Presbyterian, fell on a way of restoring ministers to their legal maintenance (*i.e.*, the tithes), and so moulding parishes that there might be a competent maintenance for each minister,—not less than £100, if possible (a very liberal scale of remuneration in those days),—which was done in many places. And where the £100 fell short in any particular parish, it was to be made up out of the Treasury of Tithes." These were not bad terms to obtain at the hands of their enemies "the Sectaries." They were much better than they got from their royal friends, the Stuarts, who in 1661 (as already stated) ejected the Presbyterian ministers *en masse* from their benefices, and left them literally without house or home. Again, therefore, by this latter act, were the Irish ministers, including Mr. Hall of Larne, cast upon the tender mercies of the voluntary principle; and again were those mercies found to be cruel. Adair candidly records, under date 1668, that "for seven years together after their first ejection, the people forsook the ministers as to maintenance, even when they were living among them and doing what they could for them; only it's not to be denied they had the people's affectionate respect, and some small accidental kindnesses from some particular persons, which amounted to very little as to the support of their families." Of this uncomfortable state of things, I fear the present narrative will furnish some illustrations, in the case of Mr. Hall and his Congregation in Larne. At length, in October, 1672, the Presbyterian ministers, having irrecoverably lost their tithes, received from Charles II., through the kind intervention of Sir Arthur Forbes, afterwards Lord Granard, the steadfast and real friend of

ministers and people, an annual grant—at first very small,—which has since been successively increased to the present *Regium Donum*; a mode of ministerial “maintenance,” which undoubtedly is in itself exceedingly pleasant, but which in many cases has exhibited a lamentable tendency to swallow up the other “maintenance”—stipend—which was intended to flourish beside it. And the misfortune is, that it grows not by what it feeds on.

We have learned from Adair, that in 1668 the Presbyterian people in Ulster “generally forsook their ministers as to maintenance.” But, although they were apparently unwilling to give their pastors *bread*, yet, with a not unusual inconsistency, they selected this very time to give them *stones*. It was in 1668, according to Adair, that “they began, in diverse places, to build preaching houses, where they met publicly, and performed all ordinances in a public way;” and there is every probability that this is the date of the erection of the first meeting-house in Larne, which was ready for repairs, as we shall see, in 1699. But if Boyle, Bishop of Down and Connor in 1670, had been allowed to execute his intentions towards the Presbyterians of Larne and other places in his diocese, their meeting-houses would have been of little use to them. Urged on by Bishop Robert Leslie, of Raphoe, Boyle was about, in the summer of that year, “suddenly to go on to the excommunication” of the ministers, but Primate Margetson, as his ecclesiastical superior, ordered him to refrain from so doing until his own triennial archiepiscopal visitation, which was to be in August of that year, when, being advised by the Lord Lieutenant (Berkeley) “to moderation towards the ministers,” Margetson procured that the intentions of Boyle against the brethren of Down and Antrim should be prevented. The Bishop, therefore, was obliged, although with a bad grace, to refrain from them and let them alone. But Adair tells us that “the envy of the legal clergy was excited at the begun liberty of the ministers, and their public congregations and meetings. They had risen up from their graves twice already, and now they were up again under the Bishop’s eye, exercising their ministry, and the whole country flocking to them, deserting the legal incumbents.” So that the newly-erected

meeting-house in Larne was, in 1668, doubtless well filled, and probably emptied the Old Parish Church.

(*To be continued.*)

WHICH IS THE INTOLERANT PARTY AMONG THE NON-SUBSCRIBING PRESBYTERIANS?

WE never gave to the self-styled "liberals" among the Irish Non-Subscribing Presbyterians implicit credit for real liberality of sentiment; much less did we concede to them the monopoly which they claimed in that Christian grace. The very loudness and vehemence of their protestations of zeal for the rights of conscience, for the emancipation of the church from human thralldom, and for the religious privileges of congregations and individuals, instead of inspiring confidence rather tended to arouse suspicion. Why all this ostentatious display of ardour on points which no one disputed, except for the purpose of cloaking some underhand design? Besides, we knew something of the men from whom those professions emanated, and we thought it not by any means unlikely that, if a fitting occasion for the display of intolerance should present itself, their vaunted liberality would melt into thin air—*vox et preterea nihil!* And, even as we expected, the fact has proved. The fell spirit of intolerance has shewn itself among the boasted champions of toleration; sooner, we confess, than we anticipated.

Our readers have not forgotten the laboured effort made in a letter to the *Boston Christian Register*, signed "S. C. Nelson, Moderator of the Presbytery of Antrim," to fasten upon the *Christian Unitarian*, the designation of the "*organ of the intolerant party among the Non-Subscribing Presbyterians.*" We shall, in a very brief compass, make it manifest that *the Presbytery of Antrim is itself the intolerant party in the Non-Subscribing Church*; and that the *Non-Subscriber*, which is conducted by its clerk, the Rev. John Jellie,* *is the organ*

* We violate no law of courtesy in naming this gentleman as Editor of the *Non-Subscriber*. His name is prominently paraded as such in every number of the Magazine itself.

and the advocate of the vilest intolerance and the most relentless persecution.

To those who are acquainted with the conduct of that "liberal" Presbytery towards the Congregation of Ballyclare, argument on this point will be superfluous. That Congregation, at two full meetings duly convened after ample notice, *unanimously* passed resolutions,* declaring that, in vindication of its own ecclesiastical privileges, which the Presbytery of Antrim had invaded, and for the satisfaction of the consciences of its members, it withdrew from all connexion with that reverend Body and united itself with the Northern Presbytery of Antrim, of whose principles it approved. Here, then, was a clear case of ecclesiastical privilege, congregational freedom, and liberty to the individual conscience. How can an individual enjoy his liberty of conscience if he is to be compelled to live in subjection to a body of whose principles he disapproves? To what do the privileges of a Presbyterian congregation amount, if it has no power to withdraw itself from a Presbytery which, as it solemnly believes, has trampled upon its rights and violated its own consistency? Does not the denial of the right to secede subject the congregation, as a body, and the consciences of all its members, to the arbitrary will and pleasure of a clique of ministers and elders, who, but for the existence of that right, may exercise the most tyrannical despotism in matters of discipline, and impose upon the laity the grossest perversions of the Christian faith? Has not the existence of that right, undeniable as it is in point of principle, been repeatedly acknowledged by all our Non-Subscribing Churches? Is it not indeed the very basis on which most of them rest? Even if the existence of that right were denied by any other denomination of Christians, surely no Presbytery professing to revere the rights of conscience in churches and individuals, could pretend to dispute it. Least of all could we expect to find it denied by the Presbytery of Antrim, which only claims to be "a consultative

* These resolutions were passed *unanimously*. The Rev. John Hall and a small number of the members dissented from them; but knowing their own weakness in point of numbers, they did not even attend the meetings, lest their weakness should be seen.

body,"—"a court of order and assistance!" But yet it is a notorious fact, that the Presbytery of Antrim, as soon as it was informed of the resolutions adopted by the people of Ballyclare, at once determined to trample on their wishes and their rights, and to hold them in subjection to its own jurisdiction, notwithstanding their solemn and reiterated resolutions to the contrary. In pursuance of this determination it proceeded, on the instant, to depose from office the Treasurer, Secretary, Elders, and Committee of the Congregation, and to deprive of their votes and franchises all the members who would not submit to this usurped and despotic authority! After such an act of high-handed and tyrannical despotism, the less the Presbytery of Antrim says on the subject of *respect for conscience, zeal for the privileges of the laity, and anxiety to unshackle congregations from the fetters of ministerial tyranny*, the better for its own reputation. It is notorious that the Rev. John Hall, and that very small portion of the Congregation of Ballyclare which adheres to the Presbytery of Antrim, have sought the aid of a court of law to compel the great majority of the people either to submit to this monstrous oppression, or to forfeit their right, title, and interest in the property of the meeting-house and the congregational manse, the latter erected chiefly by their own contributions; but it is not equally well known, that all the ministers who were connected with the Presbytery of Antrim at the time when these lawsuits commenced, have not only countenanced and supported Mr. Hall and his faction in this iniquitous attempt at robbery and spoliation, but have, with this view, sworn a series of affidavits which, if they ever see the light, as perhaps they may, will, we venture to prophesy, astonish and disgust such of the laity of their own churches as have been misled by the loud professions of zeal for religious freedom put forward by, and on behalf of, these reverend gentlemen.

This may be taken as a sample, from which the sincerity of those advocates for liberality, toleration, and the rights of conscience, may be judged. But we would advert to a paper from which it appears that this attempt (whether successful or unsuccessful is not yet certain) to rob the Congregation of Ballyclare of its privileges

and its property, under form and colour of law, is to be repeated in the case of every congregation which has seceded from the Presbytery of Antrim, and of every congregation which does not secede from the Remonstrant Synod of Ulster,—if the final decision of the Master of the Rolls, in the Ballyclare case, shall be such as Mr. Hall and his adherents expect and wish. This paper occupies the very foremost place in the last published number of *The Non-Subscriber*, which is, as we have already stated, conducted by the Clerk of the Presbytery of Antrim, and assumes on all occasions the position of the exponent and champion of its views. As we wish to do the advocate and his clients full justice, we shall give the passages to which we refer in the writer's own words.

First,—With reference to the properties belonging to congregations in connexion with the Remonstrant Synod:—

“We told him, [Dr. Montgomery], and we now again tell him and his satellites, upon the authority of the most eminent equity judge in Ireland, that his test-questions are a human creed, only differing from the Westminster Confession in the number of propositions involved. We tell him farther, that by his arbitrary dictation in forcing these questions upon the Remonstrant Church, in direct opposition to the protests of its oldest and best friends, he has brought the congregational properties of its adherents into such jeopardy as to make them *not worth a week's purchase to their present reputed owners!*”

Secondly,—With reference to the “Fund for the Protection of the Rights of Conscience”:—

“Nor is this all that is involved in the Ballyclare case. The control and distribution of the Rights of Conscience Fund, established in the year 1831, and amounting to £3000, has, beyond question, lapsed to the Presbytery of Antrim and the Synod of Munster. By the distinct terms of that important and invaluable trust, every member of the present Board of Trustees who is a member of the *Subscribing Churches*” [i.e., the Remonstrant Synod or the Northern Presbytery of Antrim], “is, *ipso facto*, disqualified; and if any of the funds be distributed *outside the members of the Presbytery of Antrim and Synod of Munster* (to whom the terms of the original trust can now only apply), such monies will be paid illegally and *at the risk and peril of those Trustees who make such distribution.*”

Thirdly,—As relates to the salaries paid to the two

Professors of Theology appointed to lecture to the students preparing for the ministry :—

“ We ask, how can ministers who impose human confessions of faith at ordinations (!!!) be any longer the recognized professors of a Non-Subscribing Association? The properties and charitable funds of *at least one-half of the congregations in the denomination, as well as the professorial chairs* connected with the Body, are thus, by the unwise proceedings of a few restless and ambitious men, *brought into jeopardy.*”

Fourthly,—With reference to the congregational property of the Northern Presbytery of Antrim :—

“ It is now as clear as light, that every trust within the denomination which recites a title to property based upon the maintenance of the principles of Non-Subscription, viz., a rejection of human authority in religion, has been, *in point of law as well as in point of fact, unquestionably violated by the two ecclesiastical bodies* who have adopted testing questions at the ordination of their ministers. The Remonstrant Synod and *the Northern Presbytery of Antrim* are subscribers to a human creed.”

And in particular, with reference to the Congregation of Holywood :—

“ The Rev. C. J. M'Alester, of Holywood, who publicly asserted his total inability to remain in any church which refused to test the Christianity of its ministers, at least to the extent of *his contemptible creed* (!!!) can now only preserve his consistency and prove his honesty, by instantly resigning a pulpit which can only be legally held in connection with principles that he has already pronounced both dangerous and heretical—a pulpit which can now only be occupied by him in violation of the law of the land and at the risk of *an expensive and ruinous litigation to the Congregation.*”

So, also, with regard to the First Congregation of Belfast :—

“ *We do hope* the laity in *our* denomination, who have already shewn such a determination to uphold their privileges, *will give Mr. Porter an opportunity of proving his consistency in a Court of Equity.* The trust by which the meeting-house of the First Congregation in Belfast is held, is what is called an open trust; and the Dissenters' Chapels Bill was purposely passed to enable the laity to protect themselves against the perversions of opinion which sometimes take place from the opinions of the original founders, when no specific trust is expressed.” [*Altogether incorrect.* It was passed to enable both ministers and people to hold congregational property (where no specific doctrine is enjoined in the trust-deed), notwithstanding their departure from the opinions of the founders.]

“ That Mr. Porter has changed the principles, upon the faith of

which he succeeded to the pulpit of the late Dr. Bruce, is a fact which we have not only documentary evidence to prove, but to which at least ten or twelve of his most influential seatholders can, if necessary, testify (!!!) Whether they will any longer permit him to boast of his immaculate consistency, in the face of such perversions, when they have in hand the power of so easily testing the fact and remedying the evil, is a matter which, WE HOPE, *the liberal lay element of the Congregation will soon take into their serious consideration.*"

We pass over the allegations which are involved in these extracts, not at all because we admit their truth, but because we are desirous of confining ourselves to the avowal of the *intentions of the party of which The Non-Subscriber is the organ.* For the same reason we omit what we might say in reference to the light in which the writer regards the great doctrines of "belief in the Holy Scriptures as containing a divine revelation, and in the divine mission and authority of Jesus Christ as the Son of God and the Saviour of men," (which he characterises, and no doubt views, as a *contemptible creed*!) except simply to declare that such an avowal does not surprise us. Neither shall we dwell on the intimation that the Presbytery of Antrim has given up all pretence of testing the Christianity of its ministers in any form whatever; for it is only a repetition of what the Presbytery has, by itself, and through its official organs, repeatedly declared. We simply beg the attention of our readers to the designs, the hopes, and purposes avowed in the preceding extracts, as they bear upon the question which we have placed at the head of this article,—*Who are the intolerant party among the Non-Subscribing Presbyterians of Ireland?*

It will appear that the Northern Presbytery of Antrim, and those who sympathize with it in reference to the principles of ecclesiastical polity, admit the right of any congregation to withdraw from its connexion and jurisdiction, whenever the members of the congregation conceive themselves called on to do so. The Presbytery of Antrim acknowledges no such right; on the contrary, it maintains that it can and will compel all congregations that may be connected with it to remain under its authority whether they will or no; or else it will force them, by process of law, to give up the meeting-houses, manses, grave-yards, and other congregational

properties which their own liberality and that of their ancestors have created. Relying on the hope, (which, however, is not yet quite a *certainty*,) that the written judgment of the Master of the Rolls will go the full length of affirming the principles for which the adherents of the Antrim Presbytery contend, the organ of the party declares that the meeting-houses of the whole of the congregations in the Remonstrant Synod are "*not worth a week's purchase!*" That is to say, if we rightly interpret the author's meaning, it is intended that in one week after the formal enunciation of the anticipated judgment, suits are to be commenced to oust from their properties all congregations of the Remonstrant Synod which do not immediately adopt the principles of the Presbytery of Antrim, *whether they approve of them or not!* In like manner, the Trustees of the Rights of Conscience Fund,—such gentlemen as Dr. Montgomery, Mr. Bruce, Mr. Michael Andrews, Mr. W. J. C. Allen, and others,—who have given their fifty or their hundred pounds each towards the objects of the trust, and who have been among its most laborious and most useful officers from the time when it was started, must give place to men who have never bestowed an hour's time or trouble on its concerns, but who have signalized their zeal for the glorious principle that in future no minister shall be required to give any assurance of his belief in Christianity, not even to the extent of those two "contemptible" doctrines, that the Holy Scriptures contain a divine revelation, and that Jesus Christ is the Son of God and Saviour of the world! In like manner, no young student preparing for the ministry, though he be pure as the disciple whom Jesus loved, zealous as Paul, and as full of faith as the proto-martyr Stephen,—no minister of the Gospel, though he have all the gifts which were to be required by Timothy or Titus, shall be permitted to share in the benefit of that fund, unless he yield his assent to the canons of faith, or faithlessness, prescribed by the Presbytery of Antrim! Even so, all the ministers and congregations of the Northern Presbytery of Antrim are to be turned adrift. Mr. Bruce and Mr. Porter, during whose joint incumbency the congregational property of the First Congregation in Belfast has

been so greatly improved, and the number of its members so largely increased that it is now difficult to provide accommodation for those who are applying for sittings, are to be expelled; and those lay-members who adhere to the consolatory and soul-elevating doctrines of the Gospel as preached by them are to be dispossessed, in order that some pastor of the Parker School may occupy the pulpit and dispense his chilling doctrines to empty walls! In that meeting-house there is a monument erected to the memory of Dr. Bruce, the father of the present senior minister,—a venerable man, in whose steps his son and his colleague are proud, at an humble distance, to tread; and another to John Holmes Houston; and another to Dr. Samuel S. Thomson; and another to John Martin; men whose names require no monument, for they are enshrined in the hearts of those who knew them, and their views of Christian liberty and truth are well known;—there is also a memorial window, erected within the last two years to commemorate the fiftieth year of the ministerial labours of the Rev. William Bruce, the senior minister of the Congregation. All, it seems, are to be handed over to an intrusive minister, appointed, we suppose, by T. B. C. Smith, Esq., Master of the Rolls, on the application of some speculative attorney, and to the few who would consent to attend such a ministry! And so also the spacious and beautiful meeting-house of Holywood—spacious, but not too large for the flourishing congregation which stately attends at the religious services there conducted—built during the ministry of the Rev. C. J. M'Alester, and chiefly from the pecuniary contributions of those who were induced to subscribe so largely as they did, out of respect for his personal worth and for his ministerial services,—is to be handed over to some “advanced” preacher, who will entertain his auditors with diatribes placing Jesus Christ and Mahomet on a footing of equality, and sneering at all claims to divine revelation! And so with other congregations of kindred sentiments: in fact with *all the congregations in the Remonstrant Synod of Ulster and the Northern Presbytery of Antrim*. And in like manner, when Dr. Montgomery and Mr. Scott Porter have been turned out of their pulpits, and robbed not only of their stipend as ministers,

but of the salaries which they enjoy as Professors of Theology, the students for the ministry in our churches are to be committed to the care of some liberal theologian, who will teach them that "the Bible is the great Fetish of the age;" that "miracles are Fetish;" that "the existence of God cannot be proved;" and that "belief in immortality is a symptom of insanity!" Surely when all this is done the work will go bravely on!

But still the question recurs—Is all this right? Is it fair? Is it liberal? Is it agreeable to the principles of toleration? Is it becoming in those who claim to be not only the friends, but the only friends and advocates of religious freedom, to boast of their intention to avail themselves of the interference of a court of law, for the purpose of expelling from their pulpits and from their offices in the Church, Dr. Montgomery and Mr. Bruce, after a period of upwards of fifty years spent in the ministry of their respective congregations—Mr. Scott Porter, Mr. Classon Porter, and Mr. M'Alester, after an incumbency of some thirty years, or upwards, in their respective charges—and other ministers whose term of service is of equal, or nearly equal, date; and to oust a score of Christian congregations in this province from the meeting-houses in which they and their ancestors for centuries have worshipped God, and which they have expended their money and their time in building, preserving, beautifying, and furnishing with every requisite for the comely celebration of God's worship? Is it equitable and just, is it even decent, in those who declare that they are the only men in the Non-Subscribing Church who are for setting and maintaining conscience really and altogether free, to inflict all this penalty, this forfeiture and spoliation—(far worse than ordinary spoliation of goods)—on Christian ministers and congregations, *for no other offence than that of adhering to what they believe to be the law of Christ?* Is it fitting and becoming in those who profess to be Protestants *par excellence*, and Protestant Dissenters of the purest water, and who cannot be ignorant that the boasted principle of Protestantism is the right of private judgment, and that the fundamental principle of Protestant Dissent is the emancipation of the Church from legislative control or the

enactments of civil law, to put in motion (supposing them to have the power of doing so) the tribunals of the state, for the purpose of crushing their theological opponents? Is it fair, is it decent, is it becoming in such men to invoke the aid of the Master of the Rolls, or the Lord Chancellor, to decide a purely religious question, viz., *What is the fundamental doctrine of the Christian Church?* and to enforce his decision by sentence of confiscation, forfeiture, and, in certain contingencies, imprisonment? And above all, *Which is the intolerant party in the Non-Subscribing Church;—that which avows its determination to employ these sharp measures for gaining a triumph for its own views, or that which never has had recourse to them, and would scorn to employ them?*

Times are changed. We remember when the indignation of Non-Subscribing Christians was roused by the expulsion of certain Trustees from the management of the estates bequeathed by Lady Hewley for pious uses, and from that of the General Fund in Dublin established for the like uses, on the ground of their heterodoxy; by the confiscation of the meeting-houses of Clough and Killinchy, and the attempted seizure of those of Eustace-street and Strand-street, on the ground of the departure of their then occupants from the presumed or actual opinions of the original founders. But now, it appears, one-half of the Non-Subscribing Congregations in the North of Ireland are to be treated in this way, *on the very same allegation*; and the only public Fund which exists among us for religious objects is to be seized by the advocates of “liberal theology” for their own exclusive use; and every minister’s widow who will not pronounce the Presbytery of Antrim’s shibboleth, is to be treated as Duncan Chisholm—but for the Chapels’ Act—would have treated Mary Armstrong of Strand-street! And all this by the *friends of religious liberty*, the “*tolerant party*” in our Non-Subscribing Irish Church!

We cannot help noticing that the vile paper containing the ferocious threats on which we have commented, has been noticed, and its threatening paragraphs extracted and reprinted in the columns of the *Unitarian Herald*, published in Manchester, by Dr. Beard and three other Unitarian ministers; but *without one word of indignation*,

of censure, of deprecation, or even of regret! All seems to be considered fair and right that is intended to put down old-fashioned Christianity, and to rob and ruin its adherents! Truly, times are changed. We remember when the very mention of a project such as is here shamelessly avowed, would have raised a storm of wrath that would have swept away all opposition in the English Unitarian Body: but theologians of the "advanced school" can see in such measures nothing to blame, nothing to reprove, nothing to regret! Assuredly, times are changed.

We cannot conclude without adding that the ferocious threats of "the intolerant party"—(by this name we feel we have demonstrated our right to describe them)—are as impotent as they are unchristian and iniquitous. They have not a shadow of foundation in fact or reason, law or equity. We defy the Presbytery of Antrim and its myrmidons to attempt to put them in force. They are absurd and futile; but they shew the spirit and the wishes of the party which puts them forth, and indicate the nature and measure of the religious liberty which would be meted out to theological opponents, *if those men had the power to execute their cherished purposes.*

ψ.

REVIEW.

FIRST LESSONS ON NATURAL THEOLOGY, FOR CHILDREN. By THOMAS BOWRING. Pp. 100.

THIS little book is a reprint of a volume published some years ago in England, and carefully corrected by the respected author, who holds at present the interesting and responsible office of Minister to the Poor in Belfast. It has been published by the Committee of the Northern Sunday-School Association, and adds another to the list of valuable works issued by that Society, to aid in the religious education of the young. It is necessarily only elementary, but it treats the various subjects discussed in a simple and interesting manner, and may be found an important addition to the books already in use in our Sunday-Schools.

AN ALLEGED CALUMNY.

REFERENCE has again and again been made in our pages to a remarkable and startling sentiment, alleged to have been expressed by a prominent Elder of the Presbytery of Antrim, to the effect that it was the purpose of himself and others to build up a Church that should not be in any sense exclusively Christian, and in which even an Atheist might hold the office of minister. We know that some men entertain very wild and pernicious views, and, from vanity or eccentricity, take pleasure in parading them; but it would be a violation of our principles of free inquiry and the right of private judgment to subject any one to personal annoyance, or expose him to public censure on account of opinions conscientiously embraced. The case now referred to we felt it our duty to publish and comment on, because it showed the loose, and, we must add, dishonest sense in which a certain party calling themselves "liberal" understand the Scriptures as "a Rule of Faith," and the unchristian opinions which were engrafted on that sacred principle: and because it illustrated in a remarkable manner the nature of the question that has latterly distracted the Non-Subscribing Churches—a question which some represent as "*creed or no creed*," but which, as we affirm,—and as the case before us goes directly to prove—is "*CHRIST OR NO CHRIST*."

In our last number, notice was taken of an article which had been published a few days before in a contemporary periodical, and in which the statement to which we had given circulation is stigmatized as a calumny; and a promise was made that in our present number we would give full information respecting the opinions uttered by the Elder, and the authority on which we stated them; and thus show that, wherever else a charge of calumny may rest, it cannot be fixed upon us.

In the end of December, at an ordination dinner in Carrickfergus, the Rev. Dr. Montgomery, speaking of the Christian principles which were at stake in the present contest, read from a paper in his hand the statement attributed to an Elder of the Presbytery of Antrim, which has lately been declared—rather rashly we think—to be unfounded. Dr. Montgomery's speech—one of the ablest, we believe, which he ever delivered, was published the next morning, with remarkable correctness and at great length, in the *Belfast News-Letter*, the statement now questioned being printed as a quotation, and reported as having been read from a letter in his hand. The Presbytery of Antrim were to meet a week after, and curiosity was on the tip-toe to know what notice they would take of this outrageous statement. It might have been expected that at least they would repudiate the opinion which, apparently on authority, had been imputed to a member of their body: but no such thing—they passed it by in silence: and now, when they have been driven to speak through their organ, the flimsy excuse which has been made for their silence is, that the statement was made in one of Dr. Montgomery's after-dinner speeches! Such are the subterfuges to which men are driven to defend a bad case. In the month of March we published in this

magazine the part of Dr. Montgomery's speech in which the Elder's statement occurred, and we also made it a subject of comment in a separate article, very fairly availing ourselves of it to show the extravagant and infidel opinions which were sheltered under the free-and-easy principles of a nominally Christian Church. Still the Presbytery kept silence. In the month of March the gentleman on whose authority the statement was made unhappily died—unhappily, not for the matter now in dispute, but for the cause of social advancement, religious liberty, and Christian truth in the town and neighbourhood to which he belonged. Towards the end of March the Rev. C. J. M'Alester lectured in Belfast on the subject of "Free Inquiry within the Church and without," and in his lecture he noticed the views which this Elder held on the constitution of a Church. Early in April the Presbytery held another stated meeting, and still no action was taken; but some days after, the following "courteous and respectful" document was received by Mr. M'Alester:—

"DOWNPATRICK, 9th April, 1863.

"I have been informed, Mr. M'Alester, that in a controversial sermon which you preached in the meeting-house of 1st Belfast, on Sunday, 29th ult., you referred to a statement alleged to have been made by an Elder of the Presbytery of Antrim, to the following effect:—'It was our intention to build up a Church which should not be exclusively Christian in any sense, which would admit Christians, Deists, Pantheists, Hindoos, and Mahometans.' My object in addressing you at present is not to complain of the impropriety and unfairness of trying to fasten obloquy on the religious body with which I am connected, by reason of any expression of an individual member; but to request that you will be kind enough to tell me the name of the gentleman referred to, and also to state on what occasion the language above cited was used.—Yours, &c., "S. C. NELSON.

"Rev. C. J. M'Alester, Holywood."

Mr. M'Alester, on receipt, sent the following reply:—

"HOLYWOOD, April 11, 1863.

"DEAR SIR,—In reply to your letter of the 9th instant, I have to inform you that the statement you refer to as quoted by me in a lecture on the 29th ult., was taken from a speech of the Rev. Dr. Montgomery, reported in the *Belfast News-Letter* of December 30, 1862.—Yours truly,

"C. J. M'ALESTER.

"Rev. S. C. Nelson."

We believe that Mr. Nelson then applied for information to Dr. Montgomery, from whom, upon having made a second application, he received the following answer:—

"DUNMURRY GLEBE, May 19, 1863.

"REV. SIR,—When applied to by any person who has either an individual or official right to ask me for information concerning any statement which I may have made, I am always ready to supply it. In the case to which you refer, however, you must feel that you have no claim, either of right or courtesy, to a reply.—I am, &c.,

"Rev. S. C. Nelson."

"H. MONTGOMERY.

In a published lecture on "The New Theology," the Rev. J. S. Porter had quoted in a note the same statement as made by an

Elder of the Presbytery of Antrim, and Mr. Nelson applied to him for the information he sought—still, it is to be observed, not by order of the Presbytery, or in any official capacity, but simply as a private individual. Mr. Porter sent the following reply:—

“ 16, COLLEGE SQUARE EAST, BELFAST,
5th May, 1863.

“ REV. SIR,—In reply to your letter of the 1st inst., I have only to say, that as the statement in the Appendix to my Lecture refers to an Elder of the Presbytery of Antrim, and, as you do not come under that description, you can have no reason to expect that I should enter into any explanation on the subject with you.

“ I take the liberty of adding, that I should rejoice to find the Presbytery of Antrim repudiating the design of founding a Church which shall include men of all shades of opinion, as expressed in the statement ascribed to its Elder, though I must say that, after allowing the avowal of that design to stand before the world uncontradicted and unnoticed for the space of four months, during which at least two meetings of the Presbytery have been held, the repudiation would come somewhat tardily; still, better late than never, and I should rejoice to see the disavowal authoritatively and publicly made, even at the eleventh hour.—I remain, &c.

“ J. SCOTT PORTER.

“ Rev. S. C. Nelson.”

In looking at this correspondence, we are struck with the fact, that no notice was taken of the statement for months after it had been published and commented on; and that it is only *after the death of the party on whose authority it was made*, that information is sought by Mr. Nelson from several gentlemen who had circulated the alleged calumny. Did he calculate that all means of substantiating the statement were gone, and he might now make a cunning move to screen the Elder, and to protect his party? Farther, it is to be remembered, that no official application was made to any person who had published the statement. If there had been, we know that it would have been promptly met, and that the fullest information would have been given. Besides, it was distinctly intimated to Mr. Nelson that the ground on which the information was withheld from him was that he was not an Elder, and that he did not apply officially. Did he calculate that, applying in his private capacity, no satisfactory reply would be given, and he might thus lead unsuspecting people to believe that there was no foundation for the report that had been circulated respecting an Elder of their body? If such were his calculation, it has been upset by the accusation thrown out against us of having published a calumny; for, although even yet, the Presbytery of Antrim has sought no information, and made no effort to vindicate its principles, we are constrained in self-justification to give the authority on which Dr. Montgomery made, and on which we reiterated the statement, and we shall leave it to our readers to judge whether it be a calumny, or a well-authenticated fact.

Early in November, 1862, the Rev. John A. Crozier happened to be in Girvan, and in conversation with the late Mr. Matthew Scott, that gentleman mentioned to him that Mr. Robert M'Calmont of Belfast, had, some time in the previous February, broached to

him and others, in the school-room attached to their church, the most extravagant opinions respecting the constitution of a church. The information given by Mr. Scott bore so directly and strongly on the controversy that has for years agitated our body, that Mr. Crozier asked him to let him have in writing the substance of the opinions expressed by Mr. M'Calmont. Accordingly, Mr. Crozier some time after received from him a letter, of which the following is the greater part—we omit several sentences referring to other matters of a more private nature:—

“GIRVAN, 3rd Dec., 1862.

“REV. AND DEAR SIR,— * * * In reference to the York Street Congregation, Mr. M'Calmont said it was their desire* to build up a church which should not be exclusively Christian in any sense—which would admit Christians, Deists, Pantheists, Hindoos, Mohammedans. I said, ‘why exclude Atheists.’ He replied that Atheists would not be excluded, and that even if a minister became an Atheist, he thought he should not be required to resign. He thought the difference between Theism and Atheism was merely nominal, that a believer in the laws of Nature was a believer in God as much as the man who held the doctrine of a personal Deity. He said a minister should have perfect liberty to preach what he likes. Mr. M'Calmont did not speak in confidence, but seemed rather to challenge discussion on the subject, and stated his opinions very frankly. * * * *
—I remain, Rev. and dear Sir, yours faithfully,

“MATTHEW SCOTT.

“Rev. J. A. Crozier, Ballymena.”

Some time after this letter had been received, and Dr. Montgomery had publicly referred to it, Mr. Scott, in conversation with Mr. M'Alester, informed him of the opinions which Mr. M'Calmont had advanced in the Girvan school-room, as confirming the worst apprehensions that were entertained respecting some of those connected with the “free inquiry” movement. So that, in addition to the letter just quoted, we have Mr. Scott's oral statement to Mr. Crozier and Mr. M'Alester. We find the matter also particularly stated by Mr. Scott in a letter which, on December 22, 1862, he addressed to the Rev. Dr. Beard, expostulating with him on the principles of church union which he and his co-editors were advocating in the *Unitarian Herald*. The following is the passage to which we refer: if any doubt the accuracy of our quotation, we presume they may have it confirmed by applying to Dr. Beard himself:—

“ * * * Indeed, if the non-natural interpretation of the term *Unitarian*, given by Mr. Martineau and others, is to be accepted, the Secularists have as good a title to our name as any class I know. They say they are “free inquirers”—they have no creed—many of them no God, and are therefore all the more creedless. And let me tell you, if you are not already aware of the fact, that a pet congregation of the New School has taken the initiative in this direction, bent on building up a Church which shall not be exclusively *Christian* in any sense, which shall welcome alike Deists, Pantheists, Atheists, men

* We perceive that in the extract, as read by Dr. Montgomery, the word “desire” was printed “design,” and this verbal error has been inadvertently repeated; but it does not in any degree affect the import of the passage.

of all beliefs and of no belief, and whose minister shall be at liberty to preach Atheism from the pulpit, if he choose, 'because,' say they, 'the difference between Theism and Atheism is merely nominal, and to make belief in a personal God the basis of union would be virtually and actually to own a creed!' Who can deny that such is the only logical conclusion of Mr. Martineau, and the 'no creed' principle of the *Herald*? I mention the above that you may see that out of England as well as in it, 'the work goes bravely on.' It is no clamour. All I said, and much more to the same effect, was stated to me in the presence of several members of our Society in our vestry in February last. The Church referred to is York Street, Belfast, and my informant is Mr. M'Calmont, who was Commissioner for said Church, when it was admitted into the Antrim Presbytery. Had you heard from him, as we did, how the New School party 'dodged' and deceived the Old at those Presbytery meetings, you would have blushed for the *Herald's* defence of that model *Christian Church*."

Our readers will have remarked that Mr. M'Calmont's statement was made, not privately to Mr. Scott, but in the presence of other members of the Girvan Congregation. Their evidence might be adduced to confirm the accuracy of what Mr. Scott has spoken and written; but to seek any further proof would seem to be a reflection on the veracity of one who by friend and opponent was justly regarded as a man of incorruptible integrity and undoubted truthfulness. We believe that we have now submitted evidence to satisfy the mind of every one, no matter what his views of Christian doctrine and church government may be; and we have shown that what we reported as the statement of a member of the Presbytery of Antrim, startling and monstrous as it is, is no calumny, but an undeniable fact.

Extravagant as Mr. M'Calmont's views confessedly are, they are those which are endorsed by his Presbytery, or words have no meaning. The Rev. S. C. Nelson has declared that their "*essential bond of union is free inquiry*;" and the Rev. John Porter has said that their principle is "*absolute religious liberty*." "Free inquiry" has sometimes led to Deism or Atheism; and "absolute religious liberty" must embrace every form of religious doctrine. When some, anxious to resist the encroachments of unbelief, urged that the Presbytery should admit no one into the ministry in their Church, who did not acknowledge the divine mission of Christ, they were denounced as creed-mkrs and bigots: and while in some cabalistic sense, which we are too dull to comprehend, they still profess to receive the Scriptures as their "only rule of faith," some are diligently labouring, if not in the pulpit, yet through the press, to invalidate the testimony of Scripture, and tear away the foundations on which the Christian revelation rests; and in the very article in which they have vainly tried to convict us of calumny, they deliberately inform us that, while they admit that the Bible is the record of a divine revelation, they hold that "the writings of ancient sages" and "the works of religious reformers" are "*equally divine*."

INTELLIGENCE.

CLEATOR MILL CHURCH, CUMBERLAND.

A SOCIAL meeting of the members of this Church was held on Thursday evening, September 17. After tea, which was partaken of by about 100 persons, the chair was taken by Thomas Ainsworth, Esq., of the Floss. The Rev. M. A. Moon in acknowledging a resolution tendering him a cordial welcome as the minister of the Cleator Church, and earnest wishes for his happiness, spoke at some length and with much effect, explaining the principles which distinguish them as a Christian congregation. Many persons, he said, condemn both us and our creed from mere hearsay evidence. They have heard people condemn us, and, without further inquiry or thought, have rushed to the conclusion that we are not Christians. We are as much Christians as they are. We reverence the Bible; and we believe in Jesus Christ as the Son of God and the Saviour of men—the one who was sent by the Father to tell of his boundless love to the penitent anxious soul. We believe that he is the mediator between God and man, reconciling the rebellious and wayward spirit of man to God. We believe him to be the Being whose life and teachings are the best and the purest—whose death sealed the promises he had given in this life—and whose resurrection and ascension into heaven form the pledge and surety of our own. We rest our eternal hopes upon God's mercy, through Jesus Christ, as other Christians do. If they read our books, and listen to our preachers, they will find that the Christianity we teach and preach is the Christianity of Christ.

"Sunday-Schools: increase to their efficient labours, and still wider sphere and higher aim to their usefulness;" and "Our brethren of other denominations: may the spirit of Christ, which is the spirit of love, pervade more largely the minds of all Christians," were spoken to by Mr. Black and Mr. D. Ainsworth, and, after a vote of thanks to the Chairman, the proceedings terminated by the choir singing the evening hymn.

FREE CHRISTIAN SOCIETY, BIRMINGHAM.

The second anniversary services of this Society were held in the Unitarian Church, Newhall Hill, on Sunday, September 6th, when the Rev. J. C. Street, of Manchester, preached in the morning and evening. The tea meeting of the members and friends was held on the following evening, in the school-room under the Church: about 250 persons were present; the chair was occupied by Mr. S. B. Whitfield, and Mr. G. R. Twinn read the annual report. It represented both the Sunday-school, and the week evening schools (gratuitously taught) as being in a very satisfactory state: it also detailed other agencies employed for the improvement of the people, including a Temperance Society and Band of Hope. A

large number the Hull Series of Tracts, and others, had been distributed. The poor and the sick of the neighbourhood had been visited, and while temporal relief had been afforded, the consolations of religion had not been neglected. The Society contemplates the erection of a meeting-house and school rooms, in which to carry on their work, as a memorial of Dr. Priestley. After the reading of the Report, the meeting was addressed by several clergymen and others, and the proceedings were varied by several pieces of music sung by the Newhall Hill choir.

CHURCH OF THE MESSIAH, BIRMINGHAM.

On Sunday, September 13, the Rev. H. E. Dowson, B.A., was inducted as colleague of the Rev. Samuel Bache. The introductory services in the morning were conducted by Mr. Bache, and the Rev. W. Gaskell, of Manchester, preached from Rom. xv. 29, and gave the charge to the new minister and the address to the congregation. Mr. Dowson, at the conclusion of Mr. Gaskell's address, briefly, but with much feeling, expressed his sense of the responsible nature of his office, and his earnest desire, with the Divine aid, to perform his duty with faithfulness. In the evening Mr. Dowson preached to a large congregation from Matt. i. 23, "They shall call his name Emanuel, which being interpreted, is God with us."

SUNDAY-SCHOOL OF REMONSTRANT CONGREGATION, DROMORE.

On Thursday, September 10, the children attending the Sunday-School of the Remonstrant Congregation, Dromore, were indulged with an excursion which must have been novel and delightful to them all. Arrangements were made with the Banbridge and Lisburn Railway Company to convey them to Belfast, and at eight o'clock in the morning they assembled in the meeting-house, to the number of 160. After a short religious service, they proceeded by rail to Belfast, accompanied by their pastor, the Rev. S. Ferguson, and a number of the teachers. On arriving at the Belfast terminus, they repaired to the Botanic Gardens, and enjoyed themselves for some time, the elder pupils admiring the many objects of interest which the Gardens contain, and the younger portion engaging in various innocent games. Due care had been taken with regard to refreshments,—an abundance of sandwiches, buns, and lemonade having been provided; and, after they had partaken of these, a few words of instruction and advice were addressed to them. They next proceeded to visit the Panorama of the Holy Land, at present in Belfast, and they returned to Dromore by the evening train. The day was very favourable, and must have left pleasant impressions on the minds of all, not only of the scenes which they witnessed, but also of the kind friends who provided so much enjoyment for them.

OBITUARY.

Died, in July, at Fitzroy Harbour, Canada West, William S. Hunter, formerly of Deneight, eldest son of Alexander Hunter, Esq., Dunmurry, aged 50 years.

Died, on August 19th, at Holywood, Mary, wife of Hugh Hyndman, Esq., Solicitor.

Died, on August 24th, at Lisburn, Anna, eldest daughter of the late George Major, Esq.

Died, on September 13th, aged 58 years, the Rev. David Lloyd, LL.D, Principal of the Presbyterian College, Carmarthen.

Died, on August 29th, at Ballyclare, David Whyte, son of Robert Irvine, Esq., Inspector of National Schools, aged 17 years. We record, with the deepest feelings of sorrow, the untimely death of this amiable and most promising young man. He was the only son—the only child—of his parents, and was naturally the object of their most anxious solicitude; while the diligence and success with which he pursued his studies at the Royal Belfast Institution afforded them just grounds for hoping that he might gratify their fondest wishes and brightest hopes. He had latterly formed the resolution of preparing for the Christian ministry, and, we doubt not, had he been spared to enter on that sacred office, he would have proved himself an able and devoted pastor. On the day of his death he was in the enjoyment of perfect health, and went to a neighbouring lake to bathe, when he was, unhappily, drowned. His parents were from home at the time, and they returned to see only the lifeless body of their beloved child. The sad event spread a gloom over the neighbourhood; and from respect to the memory of the deceased, and from sympathy with his bereaved parents, the school business in the Belfast Institution was suspended on the day of his interment, and many of the pupils, with their teachers, attended the funeral. It may be consolatory to the afflicted father and mother to know that in their heavy loss they have the sincere sympathy of a whole neighbourhood; but we believe that their best comfort is drawn from that Gospel which bids them “not sorrow as those who have no hope.” May God sustain them in their bereavement!

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

The continuation of Dr. Gannett's paper on Christianity, and other articles, held over for want of space.

Communications for the Editor, to be addressed by post to Rev. C. J. M'Alester, Holywood; or, otherwise, to 45, Arthur Street, Belfast.

Orders for the work and business communications to be sent to the Agent of the Unitarian Society, 45, Arthur Street.

THE
CHRISTIAN UNITARIAN.

VOL. II.]

NOVEMBER, 1863.

[No. 10.]

THE CHURCH OF THE FREE.

A WEEKLY journal, under the editorship of four Unitarian ministers in the North of England, has characterised their denomination as "the Church of the Free;" and it may be interesting to our readers to know how, in all fairness and truth, this imposing title may be appropriated by many of them.

It is well known that Unitarians have never, in subordinate points of doctrine, agreed with one another; while other denominations have been bound by lengthened and minute creeds, which stereotype thought on the most interesting religious questions, Unitarians have rejected creeds, and have freely exercised their mind in interpreting Scripture. Finding no authority for a Trinity, and believing that the essential and entire unity of the Deity is most distinctly taught in revelation as well as in nature, they have adopted the distinguishing, though most unpopular, designation of *Unitarians*; but they have, at the same time, reverently received and studied the sacred Scriptures, and have felt themselves bound by their teachings. When the Deist has, by argument or ridicule, assailed divine revelation, Unitarians have been among its most prominent and successful defenders. Differing among themselves in minor matters—as the *nature* of Christ, the condition of the soul immediately after death, the character and duration of future punishment—they have been, till very recently, entirely agreed respecting the authority of Christ; and they would have repelled, as a gross libel on their faith, the charge of denying his divine mission. But it seems that many of the denomination have grown beyond such antiquated views; they see no authority in Christ beyond that which a good

man is likely to exercise ; they regard the Scriptures as little more than a compilation of old legends, and the miracle of Christ's resurrection as only a fable. Sometimes, for a purpose, they talk about the Scriptures as their "rule of faith," but, in truth, they are no rule to them ; they reject everything in them which does not agree with their own notions of what is right and true, and they may, therefore, with evident justice, call themselves "the Church of the Free."

This advanced class of Unitarians have no distinct opinions : the authority of Christ and his relation to the Father, a belief in the Gospel records, and in the Saviour's resurrection are, in their mind, "minor questions," and antagonism on such points is not to prevent hearty co-operation on the part of those who belong to "the Church of the Free." The absolute freedom which characterizes them, was strikingly illustrated some time ago in a kind of ministerial conference which was held, and in which a discussion arose respecting the qualifications for membership. Some expressed one view, and some another, when a learned Doctor, who seemed to be a chief among them, spoke out and said, "Our Assembly is perfectly free. We do not ask what any man's opinions are." Yet this conference was for missionary purposes, and the members were employed in devising schemes for the propagation of their opinions ! Although so extravagantly free, they assume the position of a Church, and thus seem to claim some relationship to the primitive Christian Church. Now, let us fancy one of the early teachers of the Gospel seeking to spread its comforting and saving doctrines : would he have asked all to join him in the work, no matter what their opinions were ? Imagine Paul at Athens, or Peter at Jerusalem, urging men to join the Church, and proclaiming those lax principles of our modern Unitarians. Paul might thus have said—"I believe that Jesus was raised from the dead, but no matter whether you believe so or not, come and join my standard ; ours is the Church of the Free." And so Peter might have said—"I believe that Jesus was approved of God among you by miracles and wonders and signs which God did by him in the midst of you ; but though you think differently, and believe that his alleged miracles were but ingenious

tricks or arrant falsehoods, come and join our ranks ; we allow entire freedom of opinion." By such free doctrine, Paul might have escaped the mockery and ridicule that were heaped on him ; and Peter might have avoided the violence of the high priests, the captain of the temple, and the Sadducees ; but they would have betrayed the sacred truths which they were called to uphold, and the Gospel which, honestly and zealously preached, has lived and operated through so many generations, must have been absorbed by the prevailing Judaism or Heathenism. And this boasted "Church of the Free," in sinking the great leading features of Christianity, or treating them as "minor questions," makes common cause with Deism, and forfeits its title to be regarded, in any just sense, as a Christian Church.

But it may be said, that the advocates in theory of this extravagant freedom do not carry into practice all that they profess. Not so. Whatever their other faults may be, they are thoroughly consistent here. One of the most gifted and excellent ministers of the English Unitarian Church recently stated, that "he was unable to co-operate with such as have not a positive belief in the reality of the Gospel miracles, and such as take a lower view than the Gospel appears to him to exhibit of the authority of Christ." And presently the cry of bigotry is raised, and the Church is cautioned to beware of exclusiveness,—as if any man who thoroughly believed in the truth of the Gospel, and in the reality of the Saviour's resurrection, could join *for the spread of the Gospel* with those who regarded its most sacred teachings as "old wives' fables." Farther, there is an institution in Manchester, entitled the Home Missionary Board, designed to educate young men for the ministry in the Unitarian Church. We might suppose that some distinct belief in the Christian revelation, or in the authority of Christ, might be required from those who, at the expense of the Church, are to be trained to do the Church's work. Yet it has sometimes happened otherwise. If some young man, who may have acquired fluency of speech by frequenting secularist meetings, and who may have no more faith in the *divine authority* of revelation than Holyoake himself, seeks admission, he is freely received. There

is no test—no Christian terms of admission, and after his stated period of attendance is completed, he may be sent forth as a Unitarian minister, though his faith in Christianity may be no more than when he entered, and he may become a minister, and perhaps a popular one too, in “the Church of the Free.”

But even the wildest advocates of freedom must have some limit, and, therefore, “the Church of the Free,” notwithstanding its declamation about “no tests,” proposes “a bond of union,” or, in other words, a test of opinion—a test, however, which, as they understand it, may be accepted by almost any class of thinkers, whether Christians or Deists. The proposed test is “a desire to worship God as disciples of Christ.” Now, if they attached its proper meaning to the word *Christ*, their test would be everything we could desire; but, evidently, they mean by Christ, simply Jesus of Nazareth, who, in the opinion of some of their party, was not the Christ at all—was in no sense anointed by God, but simply a good and earnest Jew, the son of a carpenter in Nazareth. We know how eloquently some of the most distinguished Deists of a past age wrote of Jesus, and we know how reverently Theodore Parker has sometimes regarded him. Some of his precepts they have accepted, and much of his spirit they have admired, and, therefore, they might regard themselves to a certain extent as his disciples, and claim membership in “the Church of the Free.” Nay, there is scarcely a Deist in our time who would not give his adhesion to certain precepts of Christ, as, for example, the duty of loving one another, and therefore this Church can be regarded as in no sense exclusively Christian. It seems, however, by its terms, to admit only those who worship God, and is not, therefore, quite so broad as the church which our friend, the Elder of the Presbytery of Antrim, desires to establish, for it would also embrace Pantheists and Atheists.

It is worthy of remark, however, that this “Church of the Free” is free only *in one direction*; while opening its arms to receive all, however low their opinions of Jesus may be, it rigidly excludes those who believe, as many most earnest Christians and excellent men do believe, that Christ is God. Its great object seems to be

to combine all classes of people, Christians and Deists, in one great phalanx to oppose and overcome Trinitarianism. Now, we disbelieve as heartily as they do, the doctrine of the Trinity; but we, nevertheless, think that unbelief is more hurtful than Trinitarianism, and that the world would gain nothing by establishing the former on the ruins of the latter. It is amusing to see how thoroughly bigoted, in some respects, are those extravagant advocates of freedom. We remember that one of them, many years ago, set about the compiling of a hymn-book, on the principle that no verse written by a Trinitarian should be admitted, no matter how pure its sentiment or how beautiful its language, and he succeeded in making a volume as trashy and worthless as could be conceived; and, more recently, the same divine exhibited his thorough bigotry by a wanton and worldly-minded attack on a favourite denominational hymn-book, because it contained an occasional apostrophe to Christ! Their principle, then, is—freedom in one direction, to the verge of Atheism; but in the other direction, the most intense bigotry and exclusion. We think the title they have taken to themselves is a just one; we have, at least, exhibited some grounds on which they may claim it; but, as they also pride themselves on their intellectual character, and regard themselves as “foremost thinkers,” we would suggest that their designation might be improved by the addition of another word, and that they might, with still greater propriety, call themselves “the Church of the Free thinkers.”

CONGREGATIONAL MEMOIRS.

No. II.—LARNE AND KILWAUGHTER.

(Continued from p. 306.)

IN 1671 begin the earliest extant Minutes of the “Antrim meeting of Ministers,” to which the Congregation of Larne (or Inver) was then attached. From this valuable record, I take the following extracts referring to the subject of our present memoir:—

“BALLYCLARE, OCT. 3, 1671.—Mr. Peter Orr, student of divinity, living in the Parish of Larne, and his carriage and diligence in the

study of divinity well testified of by the minister there, and other brethren who had conversed with him, being admitted to trial as a Probationer, and having given an account of such trials as had been prescribed to him at several meetings, to wit, homily, common head, popular doctrine, languages and questions, &c., &c., in all which he had given satisfaction to the brethren here, and being recommended to the brethren of Route to confer with them, all which being done and considered by the brethren, they now resolve he should be licentiate as a Probationer and expectant of the ministry, and ordained a testimonial to be given him."

"BALICLARE, AT PARKGATE, APRIL 9, 1672.—The brethren commend Mr. Hall (of Larne) and Mr. P. Adair (of Cairncastle) to use diligence about the history of the Church in Ireland, and to send their collections to Mr. Drysdale, the writer of that history.

I fear my predecessor left most of the work to his neighbour in Cairncastle, who compiled what is now called "the Adair Manuscript."

"LARNE, MAY 7, 1673.—On this day Mr. Robert Kelso was ordained by prayer and imposition of hands by the Antrim meeting to the function of the ministry in the Parish of Raloo. The ordination was held in Larne."

"LARNE, NOV. 12, 1673.—On this day Mr. Patrick Shaw was ordained in Larne, by the same meeting, to the work of the ministry in Carnmoney. The sermon was at 8 o'clock in the morning.*

"LARNE, FEB. 3, 1674.—The meeting appoints an account to be taken of the parishes of Cairncastle, Inver (or Larne), Broadisland, and Island Magee at our next diet, whereof Mr. John Anderson (Glenarm) to visit Cairncastle, Mr. Adair (Cairncastle) to visit Inver (or Larne), Mr. Hall (Larne) to visit Broadisland, and Mr. R. Cunningham (Broadisland) to visit Island Magee."

"LARNE, MARCH 3, 1674.—Ament Inver (Larne) it was reported that Mr. Adair went thither, and found that people considerably in arrear with their minister, almost to the half of what was promised him for these four years past. Appears Hugh Porter, one of the Elders of that Congregation, and signifies their sense of great shortcomings in their performance to Mr. Hall, but declares that they who are Elders neither have been, nor resolve to be, wanting as to their pains and diligence, and withal declares that they are minded to bring a more full account to the next meeting. Appears also

* Perhaps the object of having the ordination service at this unusually early hour, was to escape the watchful eyes of the Established clergy, who, it seems to have been presumed, would be napping "at 8 o'clock in the morning." For the same reason, Presbyterian ministers, about this period, were rarely ordained in the parishes to which they had been called. In the text we have two instances of this peculiarity. M'Skimin, in his History of Carrickfergus (p. 178) adds a third; where he tells us that on April 22, 1674, Robert Henry was ordained by Rev. Thomas Hall, Larne, in the house of John Crawford, Ballyclare, to the work of the ministry in Carrickfergus.

John Getty, one of the inhabitants of the Parish of Inver, adulterer with Janet Baird, and confesseth his sin of adultery, and declares his sorrow for the same. The meeting, after a weighty rebuke, refers him to the Session to be absolved."

"LARNE, MARCH 7, 1674.—Anent Inver (Larne) it is reported that they are not in readiness to wait upon the meeting at this time, but promise to attend the next meeting with an account of their performance to their minister."

In 1679, troops were sent "to Larne and Creeks," to intercept some fugitive Covenanters who were endeavouring to escape hither from Scotland after their defeat at Bothwell Bridge, and who, it was thought, were befriended by some of the inhabitants of these places. But we do not know what success attended the search for rebels "in the Larne and Creeks."

The next notices of Larne matters in the old Minute Book, occur in the years 1683, 1687, and 1688, when James Johnston and Mary Simpson, of Larne, John Bigger, of Carnmoney, and Janet Edwards, of Larne, appear before the meeting on no less than five different occasions; but, as the object of their visits was similar to that which, some years previously, had brought John Getty and Janet Baird before the brethren, as above detailed, the particulars of their interviews with the ministers need not here be given, further than to mention that they were "rebuked, exhorted, and remitted to the Session of Larne, in order to absolution." In these days, "the Session of Larne" seems to have had power to forgive sins, for which reason I may mention that the members of this august tribunal, who are named about this time as attending the "Antrim Meeting" in the capacity of Elders from Larne, are James Hutcheson, John Dunlop, and Patrick Crawford. My namesake, Hugh Porter, of whom I know nothing, has been already mentioned in 1674. The name of "John Boyd, of Larne," is also recorded as a recipient of presbyterial charity.

But at this time were taking place, in the neighbourhood of Larne, events even more important than presbyterial investigations and sessional absolutions of the offences of "an adulterous and sinful generation." Although Larne, I believe, is not specially mentioned in the history of these two eventful years, 1688 and 1689,

yet it is certain that its inhabitants must have taken a lively interest in the series of momentous occurrences which ended in the glorious Revolution, and the merited exclusion of James II. from the throne of these kingdoms. Indeed, the interest which some of the gentlemen who were then members of the Congregation of Larne and Kilwaughter took in these occurrences, must have been painful as well as lively; for, amongst the persons who were attainted by King James's Irish Parliament, in 1689, appear the names of PATRICK AGNEW, Kilwaughter, and GEORGE JOHNSTON, Glynn, who, undoubtedly, were members of Mr. Hall's flock.

Mr. Hall himself survived the troubles of the Revolution. Not till 1695 did he close a ministry of nearly 50, and a life of 75 years, by a peaceful and happy death. To the last he seems to have wrought for his church and congregation. In November, 1688, an appointment of the Antrim meeting was renewed to him, "to give his thoughts in writing, *de potestate populi*," i.e., the right of the people to choose their own ministers; and one of his last employments was revising for the press "*A Plain and Easy Explication of the Assembly's Shorter Catechism, confirmed with plenty of Scripture proofs, very useful to all, especially to those of weaker capacity.*"—1 Peter iii. 15. This work its venerable author did not live to see published. It did not issue from the press until 1697, two years after his death, when, under the directions of his son, Gilbert Hall, "Lieutenant of the Town of Edinburgh's Company of Guards," it was "*printed at Edinburgh by George Mosman, and are to be sold at his shop, in the Parliament Close, and by several other of the Booksellers in Town,*" 18mo., pp. 248. Dr. Reid speaks of this Catechism as "a valuable little book, which will not suffer by comparison with any similar work which has appeared before or since." The merits of my predecessor's publication it would ill become me to criticise. But having seen (unfortunately I do not possess) a copy of Mr. Hall's "Explication," I trust I shall be excused for inserting here the Dedication prefixed to the work, which (so far as I know) is the only pastoral letter that has ever been addressed to the people of Larne, as well as the Commendatory Epistle to the people, by Dr. Gilbert Rule, Prin-

cial of the College of Edinburgh, and three other ministers.

“TO THE PEOPLE OF MY CHARGE, INHABITANTS IN THE PAROCH OF ENVER, ALIAS LARNE, IN THE KINGDOM OF IRELAND.

“BELOVED IN CHRIST,—You know that ever since my entry into the work of the ministry amongst you, which was in the year 1646, save under persecution, when I was either obliged to leave the kingdom or lurk privately in the place, through the difficulties of the times, catechising was one part of my work; first putting you to get by heart the Assembly’s Shorter Catechism, and then instructing you in the fundamental principles of our Christian faith, by questions raised from the answers of the Catechism; following the same method as is here set down both with you and with my own family. And when my children came to have families of their own, I was prevailed with by them to put it in writing for their after use and advantage. Then I came to be importuned by you and some of my brethren to allow it to be printed, which I could not think of till I had it revised by better hands than my own. Whereupon, finding some further clearness, I allowed my son, now residing at Edinburgh, to put it to the press, being the easiest way to make it common; and though now, by reason of my age, it cannot be expected that I shall see the fruits of it, yet, it is a satisfaction to me that I leave this mean of instruction for you. Now, I earnestly desire that, as I have been at pains in writing, and both others and I in revising, that ye be careful, so far as possible, to commit it to memory. There are some amongst you who, by diligence, are tolerably able to answer to many of these questions set down in this book, and though but few, yet they will be witnesses against all those who, by sloth or negligence, remain ignorant, and do not what they might or ought to do to have it by heart. It is true all have not alike time, memory, nor skill to commit such things to memory, yet, if people did rightly improve what they have of these, in following after spiritual knowledge more of it would be attained to. Hos. vi. 3.—‘Then shall we know if we follow on to know the Lord.’ As may be evident from these words (Matt. xxv. 14—30), that those who did trade with the Master’s talents encreased the same, and obtained a comfortable reward; while he who hid the talent received sad punishment. The concerns of this present life take up too much of our thoughts and time, many being rather like Martha, careful and troubled about many things, even to the neglect of the one thing needful, than like Mary, who choosed that good part which should not be taken away from her.—Luke x. 41, 42. I shall only recommend one thing more to you. In your studying knowledge, study the love of the truth, and to have your knowledge of a saving import, else all your labour will be lost; and seek to have the experimental and practical knowledge of the truths of effectual calling, of faith in Jesus Christ, and of repentance unto life, as you have them opened up in this book. I will not detain you longer from the book itself. You have in my answers Scriptural citations, at the close of that part of the answer they are brought to prove, as the

most easie way to go to them in your Bibles. I have not set down the Scripture proofs at large, of purpose that you who are so desirous of it may have it at an easie price. Every answer will read distinctly, passing the citations. That all may be useful, and prove a successful mean of your growth in the saving knowledge of the truth, shall be the prayer of him who, by reason of his charge, is obliged to seek your good. I conclude with these words of Paul to the Ephesians i. 17 and vi. 24—‘That the God of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of glory, may give you the spirit of wisdom and revelation in the knowledge of him. Grace be with all them that love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity. Amen.’

“THO. HALL.”

“PREFACE TO THE READER.

“CHRISTIAN READER,—Our worthy brother, the author of this little book, though he never loved to appear much in the world, yet was known to be a person of solid learning and judgment, and of singular piety; who as he was indefatigably diligent in ministerial duties among the people of his charge, so he was notably instrumental, with some others of his brethren, for promoting the interest of Christ and the Gospel in that part of the Lord’s vineyard where they resided or were called to labour. If the more knowing and learned in this age need it not, let them not grudge the use of this to the more ignorant and unlearned, it being suited to their capacities; and though the author was not ignorant that there were many excellent books of this nature already printed, yet being importuned by his people, he could not deny this testimony of his respect to them, and his care of their spiritual good and edification, towards which we are very confident that, through the Lord’s blessing, this Catechism may be made of good use; and therefore we recommend it to the perusal of all,—the younger sort especially, and masters of families,—who may hereby be helped in the needful work of instructing such as are under their charge.

“GIL. RULE.

“JO. LAW.

“MR. GEO. MELDRUM.

“JOHN ANDERSON, SEN.”

“EDINBURGH, *the 14th Oct., 1697.*”

The first page of the work is headed, “Catechetical Questions and Answers, leading into a more particular noticeing, and more full understanding, of what is contained in the several answers of the Shorter Catechism of the Assembly of Divines at Westminster.”

Mr. Hall, as already stated, died at Larne, in 1695. His remains lie in Larne churchyard; and in exact accordance with the foregoing honourable testimony, as well as with everything which is recorded respecting him, is the following inscription on his tombstone:—

“Here restes in the Lord the body of the Reverend and Great

Master THOMAS HALL, who continued a very worthy and faithful pastor of this parish, and a considerable pillar and ornament of this Church for about 50 years, who though he died A.D. 1695, and of his age 75, yet is most worthy to live in the memory of posterity, to whom he hath left a rare example of faithfulness, gravity, and wisdom as a minister; of integrity and solid piety as a Christian; of constancy as a sufferer in all vicissitudes of times for the truth and simplicity of the Gospel of Christ; and after all, of crowning his great virtues with most admirable humility and modesty; and so lived an eminent blessing to the world, and departed therefrom much desired in it."

At the foot of this tombstone it is further recorded that the foregoing inscription was "renewed by the First Presbyterian Congregation of Larne, A.D. 1821,—J. C. Ledlie, Minister."

Of the domestic history of Mr. Hall I have never heard the faintest legend. His family appear to have removed to Scotland, if not before, certainly after his death; and the only trace of him which is now to be met with in the scene of his pastoral labours, is the inscription upon his tombstone, as above recited. But his memory must be always cherished by every inhabitant of Larne who reads the narrative of his life, as that of a brave Confessor and a faithful minister of the Divine Word of God.

[See *Adair MS.*; *Livingstone's Life*; *Blair's Life*; *Coxe and Carte apud M'Skimin in Larne Journal*, 1839; *M'Skimin's Carrickfergus*; *Rawdon Papers*; *Presbyterian Loyalty*; and *Minutes of Antrim Meeting (MS.)*.]

Between the death of Mr. HALL, in 1695, and the settlement of his successor, Mr. OGILVIE, in the latter part of 1699, there was a vacancy of nearly five years, during which time the Congregation of Larne and Kilwaughter was probably supplied with preaching by "the Antrim Meeting," with which it was connected. In reference to this period, I have nothing Congregational to record; but the following extracts from the contemporary Minutes of the General Synod of Ulster, to which the Larne Congregation then belonged, may supply the deficiency, and also entertain, if they do not edify, the reader:—

"GENERAL SYNOD AT ANTRIM, 1697.—It was recommended—

"1. That all ministers be grave and decent in their apparel, and that this be enquired into by the respective Presbyteries.

"2. That young men be not entered into the ministry till they

be of competent age and abilities, according to the Act of the General Assembly (*i.e.*, of Scotland).

"3. That ministers and preachers use a sound form of words in preaching, abstaining from all romantic expressions and hard words which the vulgar do not understand, as also from all sordid words and phrases.

"4. That ministers meet after communions, to confer about the doctrine and carriage of one another during that week."

The "apparel" question was again taken up at the Synod of 1700, in connexion with the kindred topic of "entertainment," and the matter issued in the following sumptuary Synodical edict, which I may as well insert here, although its date somewhat anticipates the course of my narrative.

"GENERAL SYNOD AT ANTRIM, JUNE 5, 1700.—*Overture 1st.* That there are some ministers, their wives and children, who are too gaudy and vain in their apparel, and some too sordid; therefore that it be recommended to the several Presbyteries to reform these faults in themselves and theirs, and study decency and gravity in their apparel and wigs, avoiding powderings, vain cravats, half-shirts, and the like.

"*Overture 2nd.* That sumptuous dinners like feasts, on Mondays after communions, be forborne in ministers' houses, and none be entertained that day but their guests who lodged with them, and also that sumptuous, prodigal dinners at ordinations be forborne."

As to the first of these overtures, it might perhaps properly be called "a law for all time," seeing that the fact upon which it is founded, *viz.*, the great difference between the apparel of "some ministers, their wives and children," and that of others, has continued to the present day. In the second overture, the reader will observe that the brethren judiciously confine themselves to ordering "that sumptuous dinners like feasts, on Mondays after communions shall be forborne in *ministers'* houses." They do not presume to limit *lay* hospitality on such occasions. Formerly the dinner on Communion Mondays was called a "*gaudeamus*," no inappropriate nor (as I humbly think) irreverent denomination for a truly friendly festival, at which brethren (they *were* brethren *then*) innocently rejoiced together over the completion of the heart-opening work in which they had recently and jointly been engaged. In later years the name has fallen into disuse; and I fear the state of things which it indicated has also disappeared. As to the ordination dinner, the reader will

shortly find that at the settlement of Mr. Ogilvie, this matter afforded subject for serious deliberation to the Session of Larne.

(To be continued.)

AT A GRAVE.

“ Why seek ye the living among the dead ? ”

HEED well what the Angel
To mourners said ;
And write that evangel
Above the dead.

Why come with your grieving
To this low bed ?
“ Why seek ye the living
Among the dead ? ”

To Memory’s high places
My heart is led ;
Beyond earthy spaces,—
There walk my dead.

Deep, deep in Affection
Unlimited,
Still, still in connection,
Repose my dead.

The ground is no holder
Of one dear head.
They never can moulder ;
Why call them dead ?

The souls of God’s giving
To God have fled ;
Why seek ye the living
Among the dead ?

N. L. FROTHINGHAM.

WHAT IS CHRISTIANITY?

(Continued from p. 259.)

WE answer, fourthly, *it is a means of spiritual education.* Man was created for a high excellence. Everything within and around him proclaims this. His endowments point out progress as the law of his being. His circumstances lay upon him a discipline which finds its only explanation in its fitness to exercise and train his nobler faculties. Human nature is a contradiction to itself, and human life a problem beyond our solution, if we were not made to achieve a high destiny. Man was created for perfection, as was everything else. But everything below him reaches its perfection by an involuntary growth; and that which is above him, he has reason to believe, is subject to the same law, of an intelligent and self-induced progress, with himself. He must secure his own perfection by toil and warfare, by patience and long perseverance, by a voluntary adoption and an earnest pursuit of the loftiest aims which can invite human endeavour. These aims are spiritual. It is spiritual training, therefore, which he needs. He needs to be addressed, instructed, and helped as one in whom spiritual powers of immeasurable compass are concealed. There are no limits which language can describe, or imagination define, to the growth of the soul. It was meant by the Creator to put forth new energy and to reap new satisfaction through its whole course. Every year must find it wiser, stronger, richer than the previous year. In manhood it must be more vigorous than in youth, and in old age have a goodness that time shall have ripened to a still further expansion. Advancement, ascent, should be its constant purpose; acquisition, conquest, must be the title of its whole experience. "Never to rest, but ever to rise," expresses the condition on which the Infinite Father has offered it a participation in his own intelligence and happiness.

But in this perpetual progress man needs counsel and help. For it is a conflict, we have said, which he must maintain. Freedom, purity, perfection, he can gain only by hard struggle. He must work out his own salvation from much of error and infirmity, even after the dominion

of evil has been cast off. He needs therefore guidance, encouragement, and support. All these, and all else which he needs in his pursuit of the end for which he was created—advice, example, command, persuasion, in a word, all the instruction and assistance which it is possible for him to receive—Christianity either affords or promises. We shall never understand, nor duly appreciate Christianity till we contemplate it from this point of view. It is the instructor as well as the purifier of the soul, the educator as truly as the redeemer of the race. Man is redeemed from sin, only that he may be educated for the largest and purest excellence. He is called to repentance, that he may be afterwards called to “glory and virtue.”

We believe in the possibility of a continual progress towards perfection, because we believe that it is made our duty, and because we see in Christianity the means of enabling us to accomplish what is required by the Divine law. As in the death of Christ we see a pledge of mercy, so in his life we read the assurance of success. “Because I live, ye shall live also,” are words, which, as we interpret the term “life,” are full of meaning. With us there is no life where there is no growth, a growth which manifests itself in effort and crowns itself with victory. As we believe that man is never so fallen that he need sink into hopeless ruin, so do we believe that he can never attain such an eminence of character that he may not rise higher. And as we believe that no one is so degraded that the motions of a spiritual life may not be quickened in him, we also believe that no one has acquired such superiority to temptation that he needs not to maintain a watchful humility.

We believe, moreover, in Christianity as the spring of all social improvement. We have no confidence in any scheme for the advancement of society which is not built upon faith in the Gospel. We do not want intelligence without faith. It is like giving the steam-engine power without direction. Disaster and ruin must be the result. An educated people, without the restraining influences of Christianity, would only be a nation of accomplished scoundrels. Neither do we believe in the efficacy of circumstances without the operation of Christian truth in

the soul. In other words, we do not believe in any permanent or real amendment in society, except through the rectification of individual character. Christianity reaches social abuses through personal regeneration, and secures the highest order of the social state by evolving the spiritual life in the different parts. Christianity must have universal prevalence and universal control; this is our belief. It must sanctify the meanest employment and determine the worth of the highest station. Judges must clothe themselves with its purity, and rulers with its authority. The citizen must be a Christian in his political relations, and government be Christian in all its action. Like the invisible providence of God which holds together the material world, this Divine religion must hold together the moral world; and as that numbers "the very hairs of our heads," so this must govern our least important or least deliberate purpose. "Philosophy the guide of life," said the ancients; "Christianity the guide of life," say we,—the guide of life in all conditions and all places—public and private—from the first prayer of childhood to the failing accents of the deathbed. We believe in the constant influence of Christianity as the means of spiritual education for man.

What is Christianity? We answer, fifthly, *it is a revelation of another world*. We say, of another world rather than of another life, because Christianity does not merely teach that we shall live again. It announces more than the fact of immortality; it proclaims retribution, and communicates some information respecting its laws and circumstances. To have disclosed a future state of being alone, would have but partially relieved the want of man. This, indeed, was an immense addition to the amount of human knowledge. As we read the books of Providence and Scripture, it appears to us that we are indebted to the Gospel for a clear and authoritative revelation of an existence beyond the grave; for Providence seems to us to afford no decisive testimony on this subject, and although the later Hebrew Scriptures may contain allusions to the doctrine, they do not present it as a part of Divine revelation. Men believed in immortality before Christ came; but they believed on insufficient grounds—on grounds which would not bear the test of philosophic scrutiny.

We believe in the immortality of man because he whom the Father sent, the true and faithful witness, has spoken concerning it in unequivocal terms. Therefore do we recognize in Christianity the author of a hope which overcomes the fear of death and penetrates the gloom of the grave. Therefore do we account Christianity the great Comforter of man in his sorrow, who soothes his bereavement with visions of heavenly life, and teaches him to say of the departed, that they are gone, not that they are lost.

But the instruction of the Gospel does not cease at this point. If it did, although it might solace the bereaved, it would not hold out sufficient motive to man in his conflict with evil. He must know, not only that he shall live again, but that he shall there receive the recompense of his "patient continuance in well doing" here. He must know, too, that negligence and transgression here will be followed by a righteous retribution hereafter. The Divine law of duty—constant and progressive duty—must have its sanctions, and since they are not drawn into sufficient force from human experience in this world, they must be drawn from the certainty of future judgment. Christianity brings them thence, and applies them to the soul's sensibility, awakening its fear while it stimulates its hope, and by the terrors as well as the mercies of the Lord persuading it to render a steadfast obedience.

We believe in a retribution after death—a retribution just, strict, and sure to fall upon every soul that will not fear God and do his will. We do not believe that a finite sin can deserve, or under the government of a holy God can receive, infinite punishment; but we do believe that he who dies in his sins must endure suffering in another world, of which the gnawing worm and the unquenchable fire are but faint emblems; and we believe also that so long as a soul continues impenitent, it will continue to suffer. We think, moreover, that through Christianity we learn what are the essential principles on which this retribution will be administered; the first among them in clearness and solemnity being these—that to whom much has been committed, of him will much be required; and that condemnation will be apportioned to character, the most guilty being visited with the heaviest woe. In

regard, likewise, to them who shall be counted worthy to inherit the blessedness of the Father's presence, we learn that they shall be rewarded according to the fidelity which they shall have manifested on earth ; that there will be difference of condition, and not a broad uniformity, in heaven. We gather, too, from the express disclosures of the Gospel, as well as by inference from the truths which we have noticed, that the future will be a social state. And we conclude, from the manner in which it is described, that it must be a state of progress, and not of stationary, unchangeable excellence—of happiness, or of misery, incapable of increase.

These are our persuasions concerning another world, drawn from the Christian Scriptures. They are clear, precise, solemn, and authoritative. We dare not believe less than we have now repeated, because we presume not to set aside the teaching of Christ. We dare not believe more, because we do not find that he has taught more. We believe in future retribution with just as strong a faith as in human immortality. If we doubted the one, we should doubt the other. We believe in another world, as it has been opened to our view through the Gospel. And we rejoice with trembling, as we stand before the spectacle which is there presented, and behold mercy and judgment seated together upon the eternal throne.

What is Christianity ? We answer now, on a review of what we have said, that it is a Divine communication, that it is a message of mercy, that it is an instrument of regeneration, that it is a means of spiritual education, and that it is a revelation of another world. We might add yet other replies, but these are sufficient. If they do not embrace all that a grateful faith might suggest in answer to the inquiry, they exhibit the principal elements of "the glorious Gospel of Christ." If we must have a Confession of Faith, these shall be its five points. Inspiration, mercy, regeneration, progress, retribution—these words shall designate our articles of belief. Inspiration, which speaks of God, the Source of truth ; mercy, which proclaims man a sinner, and meets his wants as such ; regeneration, which denotes the change in his character which is indispensable to a Christian life or hope ;

progress, by which the soul presses on towards perfection; and retribution, which discloses the secrets of immortality and judgment. All this knowledge, influence, and benefit have come through Christ, the one Mediator between God and man. On his name we lean as on an immoveable rock; and in him, "though now we see him not, yet believing, we rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory."

(*To be continued.*)

WHAT THE SCRIPTURES TEACH.—No. 6.

WE come now to consider what the Scriptures teach concerning *man*. The earliest record which we find on this important subject is in Genesis i. 26, where God is represented as saying—"Let us make man in our image, after our likeness;" and the narrative adds, "So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him." The same statement is repeated, Gen. v. 1,—“In the day that God created man, in the likeness of God made he him.” After the transgression of our first parents, we find man still represented as created in God’s image—"Whoso sheddeth man’s blood, by man shall his blood be shed, for in the image of God made he man." (Gen. ix. 6.) It is interesting to observe that many generations later, the same doctrine respecting man is distinctly taught by one of Christ’s Apostles: for we read in the Epistle of James (iii. 9)—“Men, who are made after the similitude of God.” Although our Saviour does not employ similar language, he teaches very plainly the same truth, for he continually represents men as the children of God; and teaches all to think of him, and pray to him as their Father. The Scriptures also teach, what might reasonably be inferred from the relation in which men are thus represented as standing to God, that they have a soul, which is of infinitely more value than the body. Our Lord says, "Fear not them that kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul." (Mat. x. 29.) This spiritual being, which God has given us, was the great object of the Saviour’s interest: he came to redeem it from sin, and to renew it in holiness. The Scriptures

do not teach that we are born in "sin," or "under God's wrath and curse." It is true that David represents himself as born in sin—"Behold I was shapen in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive me," (Ps. li. 5); but it should be considered that his mind was filled with shame, anguish, and remorse for a very heinous crime which he had committed, and the whole passage is full of strongly figurative language. "Purge me with hyssop," he says, "and I shall be clean, wash me and I shall be whiter than the snow. Make me to hear joy and gladness, that the bones which thou hast broken may rejoice." Now, he did not expect, literally, to be whiter than snow, nor were his bones really broken; and neither are we to understand him as expressing a literal truth when he says, that he was "shapen in iniquity." Farther, he was speaking only of himself, in this exaggerated language of excited feeling. Some were regarded by the Jewish people, as having been born in sin: for we find them saying to a man blind from his birth, who had been healed by our blessed Lord—"Thou wast altogether born in sins, and dost thou teach us?" (John ix. 34) but they evidently believed that such was not the universal condition of mankind, certainly not their own; and moreover their opinions are no rule of faith to Christians. The following statement in the book of Ecclesiastes must be considered as throwing much light upon the natural condition of our race—"Lo, this only have I found, that God hath made man upright; but they have sought out many inventions." (Eccles. vii. 29.)

WINTER AND THE POOR.

" Dear boy, throw that icicle down,
 And sweep the deep snow from the door;
 Old Winter comes on with a frown,—
 A terrible frown for the poor.
 In a season so rude and forlorn,
 How can age, how can infancy bear
 The silent neglect and the scorn
 Of those who have plenty to spare."

So sings one of the most pleasing of our rural poets, and every feeling heart must echo the sentiment he has thus so beautifully expressed. Winter comes on apace; and

with winter an increase of the sufferings of the poor, with a call also on the rich, the well-to-do, to stretch forth the liberal hand for relief, and to bestow on those who need, the means of comfort. "Only," says the great and tender-hearted Apostle, "they would that we should remember the poor, which I also was forward to do." And the Saviour was, we know, accustomed to give to the poor out of the slender common stock belonging to the disciples with himself. We are to remember the words of the Lord Jesus—how he said, "It is more blessed to give than to receive." "*More blessed!*" Still, a blessing attends the receiver as well as the giver; for a great authority tells us of that "which blesseth him that gives and him that takes." Winter, however, comes on, and it will find many quite unprepared for the visitation. We must think how many will suffer from the inclemency of the season; how many, chilled, benumbed, will be laid open to the shiftings of the weather, to the cutting blast, the freezing wind, and be led to exclaim, in all the bitterness of destitution, "Who can stand before his cold?" Oh, let us think of the number of our fellow-mortals who are thus likely to be exposed,—who will suffer hunger and cold and nakedness, and who will be almost hopeless of relief. Even among the labouring poor,—those who can work and have work to do,—the man—the husband and father—may go forth to his daily toil, and his exertions will do much to circulate the blood in his own veins; but his little ones may, at the same time, be left at home with scarcely any means of gaining warmth—be ill-fed and worse clad; himself returning at night, most probably, to an ill-furnished, dreary habitation, finding all within it cold and comfortless, poverty freezing the genial current of the soul. Such poverty cannot but be felt as a sore and pressing evil. Infancy and old age are peculiarly powerless in its grasp. Manhood may wrestle with it for a time; but manhood with all its strength must be worsted, and fall in the struggle; the conflict is too unequal to continue long. Yet the winter reads a high moral lesson to all. Its cold is of God's sending, and for the most beneficial purposes, and among these purposes, to teach us compassion,—a fellow-feeling, thus opening the soul to the miseries of

many around us, so that the blessing of him who is ready to perish may come on the man of humanity; that the widow's heart may sing for joy; so that the loins may bless him that gives covering to the poor, that warms him with the fleece of his sheep.

The poor have claims on the bounty of their more prosperous brethren, though these claims may assume no tangible form, cannot be legally substantiated. Their distresses are their claims, and these through their common brotherhood, from their being those for whom, as well as ourselves, the great sacrifice has been made. And there are numbers, also, not of the squalid or every way destitute class, who yet need pity, the occasional helping hand, especially in the winter. Their struggles to maintain decency, even a bare livelihood, are very great, and the more so, perhaps, that they are frequently hidden from the public gaze and from the sympathy of passers by. Such are more peculiarly deserving assistance, to be administered kindly as well as promptly.

“ Poor, yet industrious, modest, quiet, neat,
Such claim compassion in a time like this,
And have a friend in every feeling heart.”

The amiable Cowper, writing to his friend Unwin, remarks, “ You never said a better thing in your life, than when you assured Mr. Thornton of the expediency of a gift of bedding to the poor of Olney. There is no one article of this world's comfort with which, as Falstaff says, ‘ they are so heinously unprovided.’ When a poor woman, and an honest one, whom we know well, carried home two pairs of blankets, a pair for herself and husband, and a pair for her six children; as soon as the children saw them they jumped out of their straw, caught them in their arms, blessed them, and danced for joy. An old woman, a very old one, the first night that she found herself so comfortably covered, could not sleep a wink, being kept awake by the contrary emotions of transport on the one hand, and the fear of not being thankful enough on the other.” Eighty years have elapsed since this was written, and yet the condition of the very poor remains much as then. Civilization is, in itself, a great blessing, and all classes feel its beneficial

effects, yet it may be too artificial, and then it hardens as it polishes, and numbers may suffer from it more than in a less refined state of society. But we want facts more than theories, and facts must be met and grappled with as they best may. We must acquaint ourselves with the stern realities of life. And, allow me to say, that much distress, especially in the winter season, arises from a deficiency of bedding, bed-coverings, and even of beds themselves. I know families in this town who have no beds—literally, a heap of rags in a corner, a bundle of mouldy straw thinly overlaid, or a piece or two of threadbare carpet, with nothing to cover at night save the miserable tatters worn by day—in the long cold nights of winter, in the dark and dreary watches of that season, what must be the sufferings of such persons? The grate almost guiltless of a fire by day, the draughty room, the broken panes, or an old hat stuffed in where glass should be. These are sad realities. They humble and confound; they make us doubt the verity or the stability of that national prosperity on which we are but too apt to plume ourselves. We exhort and we encourage the poor to lay by something weekly for the purchase of blankets, and these we sell much under the cost price; but it takes a long time to secure even a small pair, whilst to many the effort is impracticable. The winter is coming, and now is the time for considering what can be done for the helpless. Bedding and clothing, of any and all kinds, are greatly needed. Frequently has it been said to me, “I would send you some left-off garments, but am ashamed to do so, mine are so worn as to be of no use.” My invariable reply has been, “Send anything, everything you can find, everything is to me of service, no matter how old, I can do something with it, and shall account every such gift a boon.” I respectfully urge the claims, the distresses of the poor on the consideration of their more favoured neighbours. In a large house, and amidst a large family, there must be many “unconsidered trifles;” these gathered into a heap would be ready for re-distribution, and, dispersing them abroad, would make many a poor heart glad. The little boy, the little girl, rises shivering in the dark cold winter’s morning to the daily employment, and, whilst the snow is on the

pavement, and the ice covers the pool, must patter through the streets with naked feet to reach the mill, the whole frame chilled—the foundation thus laid for pulmonary disease, for decline, for early death. Yet the parents cannot purchase shoes, can do little more than find bread. We ask again. Who can stand before his cold? Not the ill-clad, the shoeless, nor he of threescore and ten, nor little children, who have not proper clothes to wear, who are not comfortably covered at night. I leave all application of my remarks, feeble as they are, to those who may honour them with a perusal, and will only venture to add, by way of conclusion, that it will give me more than common pleasure to receive and to distribute any articles, such as have been named, that may be entrusted to my charge for the benefit of those whose utmost exertions cannot procure them for themselves.

THOMAS BOWRING.

23, CARLISLE STREET, BELFAST.

A FIRST STEP TOWARDS A CHANCERY SUIT.

OUR readers have already been made aware that in a quarterly publication, which may be regarded in some sense as the organ of the Presbytery of Antrim, and which is edited by the Clerk of that Body, it has been stated—

1. That the congregational properties connected with the Remonstrant Synod are in such jeopardy as to make them *not worth a week's purchase*.

2. That, if any of the moneys belonging to the Rights of Conscience Fund be distributed to members of the Remonstrant Synod, or Northern Presbytery of Antrim, such moneys will be paid illegally, and *at the risk and peril of those Trustees who make such distribution*.

3. That the properties and charitable funds of at least one-half of the congregations in the denomination, as well as the professorial chairs connected with the Body, *are in jeopardy*.

4. That the Rev. C. J. M'Alester, of Holywood, can only preserve his consistency, and *prove his honesty*, by

resigning a pulpit which can only be legally held in connection with principles that he has already pronounced both dangerous and heretical—a pulpit which can now only be occupied by him *in violation of the law of the land, and at the risk of an expensive and ruinous litigation to the congregation.*

And a hope is added, that the laity in the denomination will give the Rev. J. Scott Porter an opportunity of proving his consistency *in a Court of Equity.*

While the organ of the *liberal* party thus “breathed out threatenings,” many were disposed to think that no serious idea was entertained of carrying them into execution. It could hardly be supposed that those who are incessantly boasting of their liberal principles, would exhibit their intense love of liberty by endeavouring, through a process of law, and in defiance of all justice, to assail the rights and plunder the property of their neighbours. Especially it seemed improbable that those who had been formerly the threatened victims of a similar iniquitous proceeding, from which, happily, the Dissenters’ Chapels Act protected them, should themselves pursue the very same course which they so loudly and so justly condemned on the part of their Trinitarian brethren. Yet already the first step has been taken to carry their foul and shameful threats into execution. The following “Notice” was served on the several Trustees of the Rights of Conscience Fund, prior to their meeting in October:—

“To the Trustees of the Association for the Protection of the Rights of Conscience.

“I, James Andrews, Solicitor, of 62, Donegall Street, in the town of Belfast, an original subscriber of £10 to the fund of the above-named Association, do hereby, on my own behalf, as well as on behalf of such other subscribers as now join, or as may hereafter join or concur in the terms of this notice, caution each and every Trustee taking part in the management of said fund, against the payment of any portion of the funds of the said Association, for the purpose of sustaining, supporting, protecting, or in any way assisting the ministers, elders, students, congregations, or members attached to or associated with the two religious bodies known as the Remonstrant Synod of Ulster and Northern Presbytery of Antrim, those bodies having, by their adoption of creeds and tests of faith of human composition, departed from and violated the terms of the Trust Deed constituting ‘the Association for the

Protection of the Rights of Conscience,' and, consequently, any payments out of the funds of the said Association, made or to be made to the ministers or lay members of such religious bodies, being in violation of the terms of said trust.

"And on the part of myself and such other subscribers as aforesaid, I hereby caution such of the said Trustees as are members of either of said religious bodies, against taking any part whatever in the management or control of the said Association, or in the distribution of the funds thereof, they being, for the reasons aforesaid, disqualified to act as Trustees by the terms of the original Deed of Trust. And I hereby give them notice, that if they persevere in so acting in opposition hereto, I will seek to make them responsible therefor accordingly; and I call upon and require such of the existing Trustees as still retain a legal qualification under the terms of the said Trust Deed, to proceed forthwith, in pursuance of the 25th Clause of the Trust Deed, to appoint new trustees instead of those so disqualified as aforesaid.

"And I further, on the part of myself and such other subscribers as aforesaid, hereby require the Secretary, agreeably to the 9th section of said Deed of Trust, to retain and preserve a true and correct record of the names of all the trustees who attend and take part at each meeting; and when a division takes place, to preserve a proper record of the votes given by each Trustee in such division, and capable of verification as may be hereafter required.

"JAMES ANDREWS.

"62, DONEGALL STREET, 7th October, 1863."

Although this "Notice" is issued in the name of only one of the party, there is too much reason to suspect that it is the result of a combination, in which leading members, lay and clerical, of the Presbytery of Antrim are engaged. And for what offence is this crusade commenced against the Remonstrant Synod and the Northern Presbytery? Simply because, while maintaining inviolate the original principles of Non-Subscription, they refuse to open their pulpits to any who do not acknowledge that the Scriptures contain a divine revelation, and that Christ has a divine mission. This is "the height and front of their offending;" and for this they are to be dragged into the Law Courts by these genuine lovers of liberty, with whom, to hear them talk, you would suppose that the Gospel was liberty and—nothing more.

We understand that the Trustees, notwithstanding this notice, voted grants, as on former occasions, to the ministers of various congregations connected with the Remonstrant Synod—only two of their number dissenting, one layman and one minister.

Possibly the next notice will be served on the minister

and trustees of the Holywood Meeting-house. In this church, and in its pastor, they appear to take a particular interest, and they seem especially anxious that Mr. M'Alester should endeavour to preserve his honesty! We suggest that they should guard more carefully their own honesty, and not forfeit it by an attempt to get possession of property to which they have no just, and, we hope, no legal claim.

If, by the threats which they are holding out, they expect to frighten any into the adoption of their *liberal* principles, we believe they are greatly mistaken. It is possible, though, we believe, in no degree probable, that through some legal decision they might get hold of a meeting-house or a charitable fund; but though, in their excessive exercise of liberty, they may drive many from buildings which they have inherited from their fathers, or which, at great cost, and with years of toil and anxiety, they have reared, they will not drive them from those Christian principles to which they cling as their most precious possession.

It may seem prudent for the Remonstrant Synod, in the face of a series of threatened Chancery Suits, and for the purpose of avoiding ceaseless controversy, to fall back on their Old Code. This step they can take without any compromise of principle, for that Code affords them all the authority they require, and more; but the Northern Presbytery of Antrim can never accept the loose interpretation which the residuary body has given to the principles of the ancient Presbytery of Antrim, and by which the ministry in the Church would be open to those who regard the most sacred facts of the Gospel as fables; and they will, therefore, at any sacrifice, hold by the Christian position on which they have taken their stand.

MINUTES OF THE REMONSTRANT SYNOD OF ULSTER, 1863.

WE notice the issue of the printed Minutes of the Remonstrant Synod for the present year, chiefly in order to draw the attention of our readers to the remarkably full and clear "report" which they contain of the proceedings

of the Synod's Committee in charge of the Congregation of Carrickfergus, and also to the excellent "Memorial" presented to the Synod by the Remonstrant members of that Congregation. The publication of these documents is important, as they supply a full and intelligible history of the Carrickfergus Case; and their perusal cannot fail to convince impartial minds of the violence and radical injustice with which the Remonstrants of Carrickfergus have been treated by the party there, who, having usurped possession of their congregational property, have connected themselves with, and are supported by, the Presbytery of Antrim.

There are many portions, both of the "Report" and the "Memorial," which we should like to lay before our readers; but the limited space at our disposal requires that we should content ourselves with a few extracts from the latter, together with the Synodical "Resolutions."

The following mild yet graphic sketch of the career of a prominent leader of the "Secession" party, is given in the "Memorial" (pp. 39 & 40 of the Minutes):—

"In the ordinary course of events, several of our early members died out, and certain new members joined us, and became entitled to all our privileges, although they had not contributed to the erection of our Church. Amongst the earliest of these new members was Mr. James Andrews, Attorney, who, on account of his education and social position, was considered a great acquisition to our small Society; and we were anxious to give him much lead, and to treat him with great deference in our congregational affairs. For many years, indeed, he was more a *nominal* than a *real* member—a *stipend-payer*, but very seldom a worshipper, and never, to our knowledge, a *communicant*.

"Unhappily, however, about six or seven years ago our late esteemed Pastor changed his religious opinions in some respects, which caused a certain amount of discontent in the congregation; and, thenceforward, Mr. Andrews took a more active share in our affairs—particularly in those of a secular nature. Whenever money was required he showed a liberal hand; and, through the co-operation of two or three new members of an aspiring temperament, he speedily acquired a commanding influence in our humble Society.

"When, therefore, four years ago, we were on the eve of obtaining a Fee-Farm Grant of our congregational premises, instead of the original terminable Lease, we considered ourselves truly fortunate in having a skilful professional friend to watch over our interests, and to see that the *new* grant should be at once conformable with the *old*, and with the intentions of the founders of the congregation.

We had never seen the original Lease; but, in the year 1859, Mr. Andrews publicly read a draft of the proposed New Grant, which we believed to be strictly identical with the Lease; and no hint was given to us, either then or afterwards, that the one Document differed from the other, in any particular, save in the date, the names of the Trustees, and the conversion of a terminable tenure into a Fee-Farm Grant. We have recently discovered, however, that the Trust of the Fee-Farm Grant contains a considerable and important addition to the Trust in the original Lease—an addition which, as we have heard and believe, it is expected will defeat our title to the possession of our congregational property.

“The original Lease, as we have shown, devised the entire property *without any qualification or explanation* whatsoever, ‘for the accommodation of the members, for the time being, of the said congregation, in connexion with the Remonstrant Synod of Ulster;’ but the following words were added to the preceding, in the New Fee-Farm Grant, viz.:—‘Distinguished by the principle of a rejection of all human formularies, creeds, or confessions of faith, and the reception and acknowledgement of the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, as now recognized, revised, and translated, or as they may be hereafter recognized, revised, and re-translated, by competent authority, as the sole rule of faith and practice in matters of religion.’

“Whether the words superadded to the Trust *were* or were *not* read in our hearing by Mr. Andrews, we are unable to say; but we do hereby solemnly declare before God and the world, that we never intended to authorize, nor would we have authorized even the slightest change in the original Trust; and that any such change was, and is directly opposed to our wishes.

“On this transaction we make no comment—we impute no blame—we have merely stated facts for your information.”

The following passages not only afford a most successful vindication of the Memorialists’ position and claims, but reflect the highest credit upon their forbearance and moderation. We see not how it will be possible for their opponents, even though belonging to the Presbytery of Antrim, to meet their statements or reject their most equitable proposals.

“Of the disgraceful scenes presented on the 9th of November, and subsequent occasions, your own Committee will doubtless supply you with a faithful picture; and, consequently, we leave them unnoticed. There is one subject, however, to which we are compelled to solicit your special attention, on account of the wonderful misrepresentations which have been sent into the world by our opponents; and which, we regret to find, have obtained acceptance even with some members of your reverend Synod. The subject to which we allude is the allegation—‘That our opponents possess the wealth, intelligence, social respectability, and preponderating numbers of the congregation’—whilst *we* are but ‘a poor, ignorant, and pitiful minority.’ Now, this question cannot be

settled by the simple *assertion* of either party; but, fortunately, we possess the poll-list made out by two of your own calmest and most dignified ministers—the Rev. H. Alexander, and the Rev. J. Montgomery—gentlemen of admitted judgment and impartiality. We shall give, therefore, the entire names and contributions of our and your opponents, who voted for separation.”

The list of names there appended, with the amount of stipend attached, includes the names of many who are marked—“recent members;” and the total number of voters is found to be only *twenty*, and their whole stipend, £13 7s. 3d.

On the other hand, a similar list of “Remonstrants opposed to separation” is given (taken from the same poll-list), and their number is found to be *forty-two*, with a stipend amounting to £16 6s. 3d.

The Memorial continues—

“To this list of Remonstrants, twenty-one new subscribers have been added, making sixty-three in all; and Mr. Cleland’s Call will show that those who signed it have pledged themselves to pay an annual Stipend amounting to upwards of *thirty pounds*.

“The foregoing tables, sanctioned by your own Committee, clearly show, that, at the time of the secession of those who have been bold enough to *call* themselves the Congregation of Carrickfergus, and so to represent themselves to the Irish Government, we both paid more stipend than they did, and outnumbered them in votes by more than *two to one*. Nay, if the honorary contributions of Mr. Ringland and Mr. Andrews (who are well known to be merely nominal members), were deducted, our *stipend*, also, would be more than double theirs. Comparisons are proverbially invidious; and, consequently, though greatly tempted, we shall not institute any: but, to say nothing of our having three Trustees in our ranks, we can appeal to our fellow Christians of all Churches around us, whether in our social position, and more especially in our religious and moral characters, we are not, at least equal to our opponents. We confidently trust, therefore, that we shall be no longer subjected to the misrepresentations of opponents, or, to what wounds us far more, the cold misapprehensions of friends whose principles we have done our best to support, and whose name, we hope, we have in no way disgraced.

“That we are comparatively poor is quite true; and that we cannot, without liberal assistance, vindicate our just rights in an expensive law-suit is quite certain; but these misfortunes, we respectfully submit, give us a stronger claim to the generous sympathy and liberal support of our more affluent brethren. We assure you (and some of you *know* it), that we possess the essentials of a genuine Christian Society; and, peculiarly fortunate as we have been, in the selection of a worthy, prudent, and most popular young minister, we sincerely believe that we only require the restoration of our Meeting-house, to render our congregation, in a

very short time, more numerous and prosperous than it ever was at any previous period. In the midst of all our difficulties and discouragements, we continue to be united and hopeful; and we confidently trust that you will not tamely permit us to be despoiled of our rights and properties for our faithful adherence to the liberal and Christian principles on which our congregation was founded, and which you have so long taught us to revere. If *you* desert us, whither are we to go?—what are we to do? We hear that wealthy bankers and traders are anxious to pour out their treasures to assist our opponents; or, in other words, practically to punish us for exercising our ‘right of private judgment’ in adhering to your Synod, and to place our Christian temple in the hands of those who have stated that they will not require the occupant of its pulpit to declare his belief either in a God or a Saviour! That men of education, in a Christian country, should dedicate to such objects the affluence bestowed upon them by Providence, would, indeed, be melancholy; but it would be far more deplorable, should there not be sufficient *Christian* integrity and liberality in our wealthy Church, to frustrate their designs.

“Do not suppose, however, that we wish you to *rush* into a tedious and expensive law-suit on our account. We are well aware of the labour, the anxiety, and the heart-burnings which such a procedure would entail upon you, and upon ourselves. We well know, besides, that the most righteous cause ever submitted to a Court may be defeated by a legal quirk or technicality. We therefore venture to suggest a course by which *law* may be avoided, and *justice* attained; and, if our opponents be honest men, and respecters of the rights of the people, as they profess themselves to be, they will at once, we hope, close with our conciliatory and equitable proposals.

“We freely admit the right of our opponents to choose their own religious connexion, without loss or injury of property; and we simply claim the exercise of the same right for ourselves. On these grounds, therefore, and because the greater portion of the money which built the Meeting-house was contributed by persons *extern* to the congregation, we make, through you, the following just and amicable proposals to our opponents, viz.:—

“1st,—That the entire Congregational Property, as it existed upon the first day of November last, shall be considered as the joint and common property of all the *bonâ-fide* seat-holders, in proportion to the amount of stipend paid by them.

“2nd,—That three Lay Gentlemen, unconnected with any of our Non-Subscribing Churches, shall be mutually chosen, to ascertain, from the Books of the Congregation and all other valid evidence, whether the majority of the said regular seat-holders did, at November last, desire to separate themselves from the Remonstrant Synod, or to continue in connexion with it.

“3rd,—That the majority, on what side soever it may appear to have been at said date, shall enjoy the full and indisputable possession of all the Congregational Property—paying to the minority such reasonable amount for their share in the same, as the three Gentlemen, above referred to, shall determine to be just and equitable.

"4th,—That the Minister of the said majority shall be considered as entitled to Royal Bounty, from the period of his ordination.

"5th,—That until the proposed amicable arrangements shall be completed, the Remonstrant Congregation shall be freely permitted to occupy the Meeting-house for worship, on the afternoon or evening of each Lord's Day.

"6th,—That the contending parties shall give adequate security to abide by the award of the Arbitrators.

"The preceding plan of an amicable adjustment, which we offer in good faith, would settle all our differences upon truly equitable principles, without involving the oppressive expenses and uncertain issues of a suit in Chancery: and we are unwilling to believe that our opponents, and the Presbytery with which they have become connected, will place themselves before the world as shrinking from a fair investigation of their asserted claims, and the peaceful settlement, upon conciliatory and honest principles, of a painful and unprofitable dispute.

"Should our equitable overtures be declined, however, we cast ourselves with unhesitating reliance upon your wise counsel and generous support for the vindication of *our* just rights, and of *your own*, in whatsoever way you may consider proper and expedient."

The following are the Resolutions which were passed by the Synod after hearing the "Report" and "Memorial":—

"2. *Resolved unanimously*—That we deeply lament the course pursued by Mr. James Andrews and his supporters in the Congregation of Carriekfergus, who, notwithstanding their practical recognition of the Principles and Regulations of our Church, manifested, under the provisions both of our Old and New Codes of Discipline, by their sending elders to our meetings, by soliciting us to make out poll-lists and to take polls, and by receiving the ordinances of religion at our hands, nevertheless, on the 9th day of November last, passed a defamatory resolution with regard to the practice of this Synod, and afterwards seceded from our jurisdiction.

"3. *Resolved (the Rev. J. M'Caw dissenting)*,—That we still more deeply lament the conduct of the Presbytery of Antrim, in practically adopting the above-named offensive resolution, by hastily admitting the said Secessionists into their connexion, in defiance of solemn warnings and protests, and occupying and holding the pulpit of Carriekfergus, to the exclusion of the ministers of this Church, duly appointed to officiate therein. We feel this conduct the more deeply, because, for upwards of thirty years, we had uninterruptedly maintained the most cordial relations with that Presbytery, as admittedly holding views, respecting Christian Truth and Liberty, coincident with our own—a fact which has rendered their rejection of the conciliatory and equitable propositions of our Committee particularly unkind.

"4. *Resolved unanimously*—That our warmest thanks are due, and are hereby tendered to our Committee, for the promptitude, energy, and perseverance which they have displayed, in endeavour-

ing to support our own rights and those of the Remonstrant Congregation of Carrickfergus, as well as for the full Report of their proceedings, yesterday laid before us.

"5. *Resolved unanimously*—That we heartily approve of the temperate and equitable proposals of the Remonstrants of Carrickfergus for a settlement of all disputes in the Congregation, contained in their Memorial presented to this Synod; and, trusting that our brethren of the Presbytery of Antrim will recommend the acceptance of those proposals to that portion of the congregation which they have received into their connexion, we authorise the Remonstrant Congregation of Carrickfergus to submit their overtures, in whatever way they may be advised, to the consideration and acceptance of Mr. James Andrews, and the other members of said congregation that have joined the Presbytery of Antrim.

"6. *Resolved unanimously*—That a Commission of Synod, consisting of the Moderator, the Revs. Dr. Montgomery, William Crozier, John Montgomery, Henry Alexander, Robert Campbell, and John Orr, together with Messrs. James Hunter, James Dickson, and John Kernohan, as Elders, is hereby appointed to take charge of the Congregation of Carrickfergus till the next annual meeting of Synod, and to act as they may deem expedient for the promotion of the peace and prosperity of said worshipping Society; with power to call a special meeting of Synod, in the event of any circumstances arising, which, to them, might appear to render such meeting necessary."

MR. R. M'CALMONT AND "THE ALLEGED CALUMNY."

IN our last number we considered the charge which had been somewhat rashly made against us of having published a calumny upon the Presbytery of Antrim, in attributing to one of its Elders a most extravagant and unchristian sentiment; and we showed, by the clearest and fullest evidence, that the accusation to which we had given publicity was not a calumny, but a melancholy truth. We received, on Friday, the 16th ult., a letter from Mr. Robert M'Calmont, the Elder referred to, in which he talks of misrepresentation, fraud, conspiracy, and so forth, throws out the most unjust imputations against two ministers of our Church, and concludes by saying that he will, without delay, expose the trickery that has been practised, as he had data at hand by which he could do so. The next day we wrote to Mr. M'Calmont a note, of which the following is a copy:—

"The Editor of *The Christian Unitarian* begs to acknowledge receipt of Mr. Robert M'Calmont's letter, without date, referring to an article in the last number, and containing grave charges against two ministers; and as he says that he has data at hand by which these charges can be substantiated, he will please to furnish, not later than Friday next, such a statement of the matter, with proof, as he may think right, and it shall be published at length in the forthcoming number.

"Saturday, October 17."

The reasonableness of our declining to publish a serious accusation against two respectable parties, without a shred of evidence being adduced to support it, will, we believe, be admitted by all. We have waited in vain for the statement which we sought; perhaps Mr. McAlmont's data are not just at hand, or it may be that such data as he has, he finds some difficulty in so arranging as to form a good defence. Possibly, however, he may desire to publish his reply through some other medium than the Magazine which contained the evidence against him. Be that as it may, whatever he writes shall receive our best attention, no matter where it appears; and our readers shall be made acquainted with his defence. Only two courses seem open to him in any effort he may make to extricate himself,—one is, to prove that the extracts we quoted from Mr. Scott's letters are not genuine, or that they are so garbled as to distort the meaning of the writer; the other, to show that Mr. Scott misrepresented him. Should he adopt the former course, possibly Dr. Beard, to whom one of the letters was written, could aid him; and any assistance which we can ourselves give is at his service. The latter course we trust, for sake of his own character, apart from all theological opinions, he will not attempt.

INTELLIGENCE.

INSTALLATION AT CRUMLIN.

ON Wednesday, September 30th, the Remonstrant Presbytery of Templepatrick met at Crumlin for the purpose of installing to the pastoral office in that congregation the Rev. Robert Cleland, late of Carrickfergus. The services of the day were commenced by the Rev. M. Getty, who preached on miracles as an evidence of the divine mission of the Saviour, taking for his text John v. 30—"The works which the Father hath given me to finish, the same works that I do bear witness of me that the Father hath sent me." The Rev. J. Calwell, Moderator of the Remonstrant Synod of Ulster, explained Presbyterian ordination, and ably defended the principles and practice of the Remonstrant Church, as entirely consistent with Holy Scripture, and perfectly in harmony with the requirements of Christian liberty and Christian truth. The congregation having signified their adherence to their call, and Mr. Cleland having answered in the affirmative, the questions prescribed in the Synodical Code, and having given a statement of his views in taking the pastoral charge of the congregation, the Rev. C. J. McAlester, of the Northern Presbytery of Antrim, offered up the installation prayer; and the services were concluded by the Rev. J. M'Fadden of Ballymoney, who delivered an impressive and instructive charge to the minister and people.

In the afternoon the congregation entertained the Templepatrick Presbytery, and other friends, at dinner, in Mr. Armstrong's Hotel. The chair was taken by Captain Whitla, of Lisboyne, whose ancestors had been connected with the congregation from its be-

ginning, and whose father had been its long-tried, zealous, and influential supporter. The vice-chair was occupied by Mr. William McErvale. The chairman, in proposing "The Remonstrant Congregation of Crumlin," informed the members of the congregation that the bequest of £100, left by his late father, George Whitla, Esq., towards the erection of a manse in connexion with the congregation, was at their disposal as soon as they should be in a position to claim it. He also informed them of the generous intentions of his relative, Valentine Whitla, Esq., in relation to the pecuniary affairs of the congregation. Dr. Hume, of Crumlin, proposed, in the warmest and most complimentary terms, "The health of the Rev. Dr. Montgomery," regretting his absence from amongst them, and the illness to which it was owing. The Rev. John A. Crozier returned thanks. Various other toasts were given and suitably responded to.

On the same evening a soiree was given by the congregation in the meeting house, when nearly 400 persons of various religious denominations, including many friends from Belfast and elsewhere, sat down to tea. After tea, the chair was taken by James Hunter, Esq. The proceedings were of a most agreeable, useful, and harmonious character.

RADEMON SUNDAY-SCHOOL.

The anniversary of the Rademon Sunday-School, in connexion with the Remonstrant Synod, was celebrated on Tuesday evening, Sept. 22nd. There was a very large attendance of both teachers and scholars, together with many visitors and members of the congregation not directly connected with the school. The proceedings commenced with prayer by their esteemed pastor, the Rev. William Crozier, who, by his presence with them, has contributed in no small degree to the prosperity of the school. All having sat down to tea, partook abundantly of the good things provided for them. The proceedings of the evening were agreeably diversified by the singing of select pieces of sacred music, under the management of their precentor, Mr. James Murphy. Before separating they were all regaled with a plentiful supply of fruit. Great praise is due to Mr. James Martin, the teacher of the day-school, and also to Mr. Hans Graham, the superintendent of the Sunday-school, for carrying out the arrangements which gave such general satisfaction.

UNITARIAN YOUNG MEN'S CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATION.

The annual meeting of this Association was held in the Society's Reading Room, on Thursday evening, October 1,—F. D. Finlay, Esq., in the chair. The Secretary read the Annual Report of the Committee, and a Statement of Accounts was submitted by the Treasurer and received by the meeting. The Committee expressed its regret that the Association had not, during the past year, evinced that activity which was necessary to promote the objects for which it was formed, and recommended that it should be dissolved. After an animated discussion, in which various members took part, it was unanimously agreed that the Association be continued, and officers for the ensuing year were appointed.

OBITUARY.

Died, on October 7th, at Holywood, William Greenfield, M.D., aged 30 years. In the early, and, humanly speaking, untimely death of Dr. Greenfield, many families have been deprived not only of a valued physician, but of a tried and trusted friend, the poor have lost one of their best benefactors, and the town and neighbourhood to which he belonged have sustained a heavy loss. Gifted with no ordinary abilities, he had carefully cultivated them, and had stored his mind with much and varied information, not only in the branches that pertained to his profession, but in the walks of literature and general knowledge. His skill and success as a practitioner have been strikingly evidenced by the respect in which he was held by his brethren of the medical profession, by the confidence reposed in him by many of the most respectable and intelligent families in the neighbourhood, and by the tears that have been shed in many homes at his sad and unexpected removal; while his high integrity, his independent and manly character, his kindness and generosity of heart, his sympathy with the poor and his readiness to help them, won for him general respect and confidence. Firm in the profession and maintenance of his own religious and political principles, he never allowed diversity of opinion to interfere with the charities of life, and he numbered among his most intimate friends persons of various parties and denominations. Dr. Greenfield fell a victim to fever, caught, it is supposed, in the discharge of his professional duty. During his illness the deepest interest was felt in his case, and the news of his death spread a gloom over the town. The large concourse of persons that attended his funeral touchingly expressed the respect in which he was held and the sorrow that was felt at his death. Four of his professional brethren carried his remains to the grave, and the funeral service was performed by his friend and pastor, the Rev. C. J. M'Alester.

Death is always impressive; but it is peculiarly saddening when it thus strikes down one who was but yet in early manhood—one who had started on an honourable and useful career, and had already given the earnest of a noble and successful life. Such an event seems, for a time, almost to overturn our faith in a wise and beneficent providence; but in these darkest scenes of life, the light of the Gospel shines out most brightly, and our hearts turn with increasing faith and love to him in whom death has been robbed of its sting and the grave of its victory; and while, for the parents thus suddenly bereft of their first-born son, in whom they felt a just and honourable pride, and for a brother whose heart was bound up in the departed, deep and general sympathy is felt, we believe they draw their chief comfort from the hopes and promises of that Volume in which life and immortality are brought to light.

Communications for the Editor, to be addressed by post to Rev. C. J. M'Alester, Holywood; or, otherwise, to 45, Arthur Street, Belfast.

THE
CHRISTIAN UNITARIAN.

VOL. II.]

DECEMBER, 1863.

[No. 11.

THE JUDGMENT IN THE BALLYCLARE CASE.

MOST of our readers are aware that the Right Honourable the Master of the Rolls has delivered his written judgment in the case of Gault and others, relators, on behalf of the majority of the Congregation of Ballyclare, against the Rev. John Hall and others, respondents, constituting or representing the very small section of the members who adhere to that Reverend Gentleman and to the Presbytery of Antrim; and that his lordship's decision virtually declares that the majority of the Congregation have forfeited all right and title and interest in the Meeting-house, Grave-yard, Session-house, Manse, Library, and other appurtenances of the Congregational property, except on the condition of their giving in their adhesion to the Rev. Mr. Hall, and owning allegiance to the Presbytery of Antrim. As this condition is not likely to be complied with, the act of spoliation may be regarded as complete, so far as the sentence of the Rolls Court can effect that object. The relators are further mulcted in the full costs of both parties.

We look upon this as a monstrous decision; but, after witnessing the bearing and demeanour of the judge while the case was before him, it does not take us by surprise. The case had not proceeded far before his lordship avowed from the bench that he had been in communication respecting it with a minister of the "orthodox presbyterian church," by whose suggestions, on the matters submitted to him, he was guided; although those statements were not only not verified by oath, but were utterly unknown to the parties in the case, except so far as his lordship allowed some of them to ooze out. It is unnecessary to add that those suggestions, so far as their nature was

intimated, were, all of them, directly and bitterly hostile to the relators in the suit before the court. In the course of the hearing the counsel for the relators, especially Mr. Walsh, Q C., were exposed to a series of interruptions, captious criticisms, and peevish remarks from his lordship, such as we never before witnessed in a court of justice, and such as astonished some of the most experienced practitioners in the Rolls. It was indeed wonderful how the advocates who were thus treated were able to continue their addresses at all. Need we say that the counsel for Mr. Hall and his adherents were subjected to no such rude attacks? Lastly, in the opinion which his lordship pronounced orally at the close of the hearing, he contrived to introduce a whole farrago of sneers, sarcasms, and insinuations of scandalous conduct, directed against the relators and their witnesses, imputing to the former, without a shadow of proof, the basest motives, and charging the latter, (of whom there is none that is not fully equal to himself in point of personal respectability, and, we may add, not one who, in his place, would have been capable of such conduct as he himself displayed,) with nothing short of *corrupt perjury*! Altogether it was one of the most melancholy exhibitions of temper, that has been, within the period of which we have knowledge, manifested by any person holding a public office, and who ought to preserve the appearance at least of patience and impartiality.

His lordship, on that occasion, intimated that he would deliver a written judgment at the beginning of Michaelmas Term: and accordingly, on the 3rd November, he read an elaborate paper which fills upwards of seven closely printed columns of the *Dublin Evening Mail*, in which it is given at full length, manifestly from his own manuscript. We are happy to observe, that in this long argument his lordship has been carefully on his guard against his prevailing infirmity; and warned, it may be, of the impression left by his former vituperative address, —has abstained (except in one instance,) from those scandalous imputations in which he dealt so freely on the previous occasion. We could have wished, for the sake of his own character, that he had had the manliness to retract language which he ought never to have uttered;

but we are given to understand that this is his lordship's way of withdrawing imputations that he has incautiously thrown out; and we accept it as such. He has not, indeed, been able to divest himself of the feelings of an advocate, and occasionally expresses himself in terms which suit a counsel pleading for his client rather than a judge deciding evenly and impartially on the merits of a case which had been argued at his bar. For example, he says,—“*I shall show just now, if I am to adopt the statement in the 12th paragraph of the petition, that the Rev. Mr. Jellie was properly installed in the York Street Chapel;*” and elsewhere, “*In order to show the attempt of the Rev. Mr. M'Alester to alter the existing usages and practices of the Presbytery of Antrim, it will now be right to refer to the 12th paragraph of the petition,*” &c., &c., &c. This is the language of an advocate, who wishes to prove his client's case to the satisfaction of the court before which he pleads; not of a judge who is called upon merely to state the impression which the facts and arguments adduced have left upon his own mind. A calm judge would have said, “It appears to me that such was the fact;” or, “I feel bound to decide that such is the law.” But not so the Master of the Rolls. Labouring to make good the case for the respondents, his lordship has unconsciously adopted the phraseology which would have been proper and becoming had he been pleading for them at the bar.

But this is of inferior moment. We are sorry to have to declare that his lordship's argument, elaborate as it is, betrays evident proof of having been written without due attention to the facts which were in proof before him; some of which, indeed, were of sufficient notoriety to be taken notice of, as matters of history, without being specifically deposed. Of this judicial oversight we shall only advert to one example. It was stated in evidence by several witnesses, and contradicted by none,—indeed the fact is so notorious that no man desiring to preserve the least credit or character for veracity could venture to contradict it,—that the Remonstrant Synod of Ulster has never, since the date of its formation, been without a *Code of Discipline*, prescribing the form and manner of ordaining candidates for the ministry, and licensing preachers of

the Gospel. From 1829 till 1857, the Code originally drawn up by the General Synod of Ulster before the separation, was in force; in 1857 the New Code, or rather the Revised Code, which is infinitely less stringent in its requirements than the old, was adopted. This is matter of public notoriety; but was also sworn to by unimpeachable witnesses, and contradicted by none. Yet his lordship says, "In the year 1853, the Remonstrant Synod of Ulster, with which the Presbytery of Antrim and Congregation of Ballyclare never have been in connection, determined to draw up a Code of Discipline; *the said Synod having had, as I understand, no written Code previously.*" Doubtless his lordship so understands, or misunderstands, the fact; and it is a very material fact as bearing upon the question,—which also his lordship grossly misunderstands,—What is the sense and meaning of the term non-subscription as used and understood by the non-subscribing presbyterian churches in Ireland? But it is clear that if his lordship had read over the depositions with any reasonable degree of care, he could not have fallen into this mistake. Indeed he himself copies from one of the documents put in proof, a passage which says that the terms of ministerial communion laid down in the New Code "are much less stringent than those which were sanctioned by *the Synod's former Code*, to which no objection was ever made by the congregation of York Street." But this passage, though written or copied by his own pen, failed to open his eyes to the fact that there was "*a former code*" anterior to that of 1857.

But although his lordship could not see this fact, which is plain as the noon-day sun on the face of the depositions, he has been able to discern another fact of some importance in the case, and to which he evidently attaches much weight, for he recurs to it again and again; but of which no evidence was or could be adduced—a fact, too, with respect to the state of which the utmost and most notorious publicity exists. He seems to be actually haunted with the notion that there was, on the part of some members of the Presbytery of Antrim, a design to introduce into that body the Remonstrant Synod's New Code of Discipline, to which he feels such a determined antipathy; or, at least, to adopt the cele-

brated "Three Questions" which it specifies; and to make it imperative on all candidates for license or ordination to answer them affirmatively. No one had the hardihood to swear this; nay, several unimpeachable witnesses unequivocally, though incidentally, deposed to facts which are utterly inconsistent with it; and indeed the state of the facts on this question is too well known to be contradicted. But the eye of the Master of the Rolls, dim as it is to the perception of evidence expressly tendered, is keen enough to discover proofs of things that exist only in the wide domain of his own imagination. He says, "The adoption of the Code of Discipline of the Remonstrant Synod, as to ordination and installation, . . . would have introduced a new practice in the Presbytery of Antrim," &c., &c. Undoubtedly it would; but who, except his lordship, ever dreamed that any one ever thought of or wished for its adoption? Again, he tells us, "The introduction of the Code of Discipline of the Remonstrant Synod, as to ordination, would be in contravention of the usage and practice" of the presbytery. He cannot get rid of the ghost that his own fancy has conjured up.

Next to his lordship's antipathy to the Remonstrant Synod's New Code of Discipline, and to its celebrated "Three Questions," is his animosity against the statement of doctrines involved in the resolution moved by the Rev. C. J. McAlester on the 1st of January, 1862, and rejected with indignation by the Presbytery of Antrim. That resolution begins by a recital stating that "*recent events in connection with this Presbytery have caused serious apprehensions in the minds of some members*, that candidates for license, ordination, or installation, may be accepted, although they should not believe in the Holy Scriptures as containing a Divine Revelation, or in the Divine Mission and authority of Jesus Christ as the Son of God and the Saviour of men." On this point the Master of the Rolls pronounces, "I have had no satisfactory evidence laid before me that there was *any foundation for the recital* in Mr. McAlester's motion." Yet, he himself afterwards states that that motion was supported by one-fourth of all the members who were present when it was discussed and put to the vote.

Surely, the fact that so many voted for the motion, *including the recital*, is sufficient proof that the "serious apprehensions" which it recites were actually entertained! No one would vote for such a motion without either feeling those apprehensions himself or knowing that they were felt by others. This was "no satisfactory evidence" to his lordship's mind; but to many other men, not less acute and perspicacious, the facts, as stated by himself, would have appeared amply sufficient to bear out the recital. In truth, we do not suppose there is a single person who has heard of the events referred to, who is not fully convinced of *the existence of such apprehensions*. Whether they are well founded or not remains to be proved, and time alone can tell. But the recital does not say that they are well or ill-founded, it merely affirms that they exist. And who, except his lordship, questions their existence?

However, at present we are more immediately concerned with the declarative part of the motion referred to than with the recital in the preamble. The resolution goes on to say—"We do hereby declare, in order to remove such apprehensions, and clearly to exhibit the Scriptural character of our church, that to license, ordain, or instal any candidate, without being fully satisfied, by his own explicit declaration, or by answers to questions asked, that he believes in Christ's Divine Mission and authority as the Son of God and the Saviour of men, and that he believes the Scriptures to contain a Divine Revelation, would be an obvious dereliction of our Christian duty, a clear violation of the principles upon which the Presbytery of Antrim was founded, an open departure from the usages hitherto observed on such occasions, and an utter unfaithfulness to the trust reposed in us of training or sanctioning persons as duly qualified to instruct our people in the fundamental principles of the Christian faith; and that we have no intention, nor do we mean, to license, ordain, or instal any candidate, without being fully satisfied as aforesaid." His lordship's aversion to this motion appears to be nearly equal to that of the Presbytery of Antrim, which rejected it "with indignation." He says of it, speaking as we have already remarked, in the style which would naturally be

adopted by the counsel for the respondents, "In order to show the attempt of the Rev. Mr. M'Alester to *alter the existing usage and practice of the Presbytery of Antrim*," &c., &c. Upon this question of usage and practice a great mass of evidence was laid before him, to none of which has he made the slightest allusion, except to the entries of license, ordination, and installation, in the existing records of the presbytery. The earlier records are lost, and those which survive are, in all such cases, extremely brief, and in some notoriously defective. It will hardly be credited, that, although the existing minute-book commences some years anterior to the settlement of the late Dr. Bruce in Belfast, there is absolutely *no entry whatever* shewing that he was ever ordained or installed, or received into the presbytery by any act or formality of any kind! All that is to be found is, that at a certain meeting in the year 1790, and at subsequent meetings, his name appears in the list of members who were present. It seems to us idle, and even ridiculous, to build an argument on the silence of a record which had been so defectively kept; yet, it is to the argument from its silence, and to that argument alone that the Master of the Rolls appeals, in the way of evidence, to support his assertion. He says there are 48 entries of license, ordination, and installation; and in none of them does he find any questions were put to the candidate on the topics touched upon in Mr. M'Alester's motion. With regard to several of them, it is true that nothing is stated, except that, on a specified day, a certain person was licensed or ordained. But the Minutes themselves show that, on some occasions, either questions were asked or a declaration was made by the candidate; and even add that this was in accordance with the "*usual*" practice. His lordship says, "It does not appear, from these several entries, to have been the usage or practice of the Presbytery of Antrim to put testing doctrinal questions to candidates for ordination or installation." Yet, a little farther down, he has himself cited an entry dated the 6th of March, 1811, which states that, at the ordination of the late Mr. Carley, in Antrim, that gentleman "*made a public declaration of his views* in taking upon himself the charge of the Congrega-

tion of Antrim, after which he was ordained;" and another, which states that, in 1832, at the installation of the Rev. J. Scott Porter in the First Congregation, Belfast, "the *usual inquiries* were made by the Moderator regarding his faith in the *Holy Scriptures*, and his resolution to maintain and expound them with fidelity." This distinctly shews that it was "*usual*" to make such inquiries, if not rendered unnecessary by a declaration of faith given in by the candidate himself. Nor ought it to be passed over in silence, that, in respect to many of those acts of ordination and installation which are more briefly recorded, his lordship had before him other proof specifying *the very questions that had been put to the candidates*, together with the answers returned, and a whole series of documentary evidence, shewing that, from the year 1742 down to the present day, it was "customary, on such occasions," to question the candidate, and sometimes at considerable length, or else to require a statement respecting his belief in the fundamental articles of the Christian faith. But all this his lordship has overlooked. He has looked to the minute-book exclusively, which, as appears on its face, generally omits all particulars and details, and he seems to be quite unaware that its deficiencies have been supplemented by the testimony of unimpeachable witnesses, living and dead. Were his lordship's reasoning valid, it might be proved, from the minute-book, that there never was a prayer offered up by any member of the presbytery when supplying a vacant congregation, because, in such cases, the entry uniformly is, that certain ministers were appointed "to *preach*" on particular days, without any mention of prayer or psalmody!

There is one point more on which we shall touch at present, in reference to the judgment of the Master of the Rolls on the case submitted to him. He takes the "*Code of Discipline*" published by the *General Synod of Ulster*, and finding it there laid down that "To the presbytery belongs the superintendence of all matters relating to doctrine, discipline, and order, in the several congregations under its care," he assumes that this law gives to the presbytery absolute and arbitrary control over all the officers, records, and members, and over the

management of the property of the congregation ; makes them, in fact, what is termed, "The Visitors" of each congregation within their bounds ; and that as "Visitors" they are empowered to decide on all such points, at their will and pleasure, without any appeal to a court of law or equity. This sweeping principle he proceeds to apply to the admission of William Adamson by the Presbytery of Antrim, as elder to represent the Congregation of Ballyclare, in the month of November, 1861. It is well known that the late Mr. Dundee was unanimously chosen by the Session and Committee, in whom the power of election is vested ; and that his appointment was confirmed by a majority of 42 to 19 at a meeting of the congregation convened immediately afterwards : while W. Adamson was chosen by Mr. Hall and 19 others, who, after the close of that meeting, remained in the Meeting-house, and there clandestinely proceeded to a mock election ; and that his election never was sanctioned by the Session or Committee. His lordship applies the same principle to the appointments of Treasurer, Secretary, Committee, and other Officers of the Congregation. They had been duly elected, we believe in every case unanimously, by their fellow-members, in accordance with the rules drawn up and ratified by the congregation itself, conformably to an advice given by the presbytery. But the presbytery has *turned them all out of office, deprived them of all control over the property entrusted to their care, and even denied them the exercise of their franchise as members of the congregation!* His lordship declines to pronounce any judgment on this high-handed act of oppression, on the ground that the presbytery being "the Visitors of the congregation," their decision is, in every case final, and cannot be questioned in any court of law or equity. It is evident that this refusal to decide the point is itself a very sharp and broad decision, not only on the case of Ballyclare, but on the rights and privileges of all presbyterian congregations throughout the United Kingdom.

Now, we, in our ignorance, having no higher authority than Judge Blackstone to guide us (see *Commentaries*, &c., Book I., chap. xviii,) had conceived that *Visitors* could only belong to *corporations* ; which Presbyterian congre-

gations certainly are not. Granting, however, that they could, by any straining of the law, (though we do not see how it is possible,) be elevated to the rank of corporations, Visitors can only be appointed, and their authority defined, by the king, or by the express act of the founders, neither of whom has ever invested the presbytery with the irresponsible power assigned to them by his lordship. The "*Code of Discipline*," to which he refers as the foundation of his views, never had any force or authority whatever in the Presbytery of Antrim; this his lordship is ready enough to allege when he discusses the subject of tests of faith; yet here he concedes to the presbytery the unlimited control over the rights and properties of congregations, on no other ground or warrant. Lastly, whatever may be the case in other presbyterian bodies, the Presbytery of Antrim, in its answers to a set of queries from this very Congregation of Ballyclare, deliberately disclaimed the possession of any such prerogatives; and these answers are not only recorded in the minutes which his lordship had before him, but were fully set out, and specially proved, in the depositions in the case. It is for the congregations which remain in connexion with the Presbytery of Antrim—some of which were formerly distinguished for their free and independent spirit—to consider how they will relish this arbitrary, uncontrolled, and irresponsible power thus awarded to that reverend body. His lordship's *dictum* makes them the bond-slaves of that presbytery as regards their ecclesiastical rights and franchises, and mere occupants, during its pleasure, of their meeting-houses, school-houses, grave-yards, manses, and all other properties and endowments. But this is purely a question for themselves to consider. We know the ancestors of some among them would have scorned to live in any church which claimed such a despotic authority.

And now a word on the matter of costs. They will be very heavy; and the relators are sentenced to pay the whole. Is this fair or equitable? His lordship repeatedly, in the course of the argument, demanded to be referred to a case in point: he was told by the counsel on both sides that there was *no case exactly in point*; no case having occurred in which a minister and the minority

of his people had attempted to oust the bulk of the congregation from their rights and properties. The case was absolutely new ; it involved a great principle ; and therefore it was one which it was right and proper to bring before the court for adjudication. On the hearing of the injunction-cause in the summer of last year, his lordship had told the respondents in that case, (who are the relators in this,) that if Mr. Hall and his partisans attempted to interfere with their properties and rights, the matter should be brought before him, and he would do them justice. Several such infractions were proved, by evidence to which his lordship does not once allude in the course of his dissertation of seven columns ; the case was, in consequence, brought before him ; and the manner in which he has done the relators justice, is, by first railing at them from the bench in his oral harangue, and now by denying them all redress, and mulcting them in the costs of both sides, by his elaborate written judgment. We leave these facts to speak for themselves.

We have not adverted to the nature of the evidence which was put in by the respondents in this cause : but we can assure our readers that some of it was of a very extraordinary character indeed, coming from the professed champions of congregational rights and free inquiry.

J. S. P.

THE FIRST CHRISTMAS MORN.

CALM on the listening ear of night
Come heaven's melodious strains,
Where wild Judea stretches far
Her silver-mantled plains.

Celestial choirs, from courts above,
Shed sacred glories there,
And angels, with their sparkling lyres,
Make music on the air.

The answering hills of Palestine
Send back the glad reply ;
And greet, from all their holy heights,
The day-spring from on high.

O'er the blue depths of Galilee
There comes a holier calm,
And Sharon waves, in solemn praise,
Her silent groves of palm.

"Glory to God" the sounding skies
Loud with their anthems ring—
"Peace to the earth, good-will to men,
From heaven's eternal King!"

Light on thy hills, Jerusalem!
The Saviour now is born!
And bright on Bethlehem's joyous plains
Breaks the first Christmas morn.

E. H. SEARS.

THE CHRISTIAN MIRACLES.

DOWN to the present day the Miracles have continued to direct attention—as of old, sometimes with a friendly, at others with a hostile disposition—to the claims, person, teachings, and sufferings of Jesus Christ. Different, indeed, now is the nature of their appeal. When first performed, they were facts and deeds which spoke to the eye; they were afterwards heard of "by the hearing of the ear;" at present they are part of a record which is received in virtue of the general guarantees of credibility that it bears. Useful, still, as illustrating the origin and accounting for the progress of Christianity, they are of special value in the exemplifications which they give of the Saviour's character, and scarcely less so in going far to reproduce before our eyes the entire scene which was again and again called into being, by the exercise of his divine powers, as he went about teaching, preaching, and doing good.

The miracle of Christ's resurrection and ascension is the great central fact of the Gospel, which, resting as it does on the most solid grounds, is an absolutely indispensable element in the history of the infant church, and no less indispensable, as a preliminary, to that spiritual reign at the right hand of the Majesty on high, which is to issue in the conversion of the world. Say the resurrec-

tion is not a reality,—you repudiate the Gospel. If to these latter days it does not prove the truth of Christianity, certainly, without it, Christianity has neither truth, substance, nor light. So in-wrought into the rise, spread, and history of the religion of Jesus is the resurrection, so much does it form an integral part of the Christian records, that with it the Gospel stands or falls. Deny or disprove the resurrection—the result is the production, not of a system of virtue or philosophy, but of a lifeless mass of incongruous materials, in which what deception cannot explain must be referred to the weakness of an early faith or the impressiveness of a gloomy fanaticism.—*Beard's Dictionary of the Bible*, Article, “*Miracles*.”

RECENT MEETING OF THE REMONSTRANT SYNOD.

OUR Intelligence department contains a condensed report of the recent meeting of the Remonstrant Synod, from which it will be seen that a series of resolutions was unanimously adopted, to the effect that the object of the Synod in adopting “the Three Questions” was to *enlarge* and not *restrict* the Christian liberties both of Congregations and Ministers—that they *did* not, and *do* not, consider that these questions involve the adoption of a human creed, and that they adhered to the great principles of religious liberty on which they separated from the General Synod; but that, as certain legal interpretations of “the Three Questions” might imperil their ecclesiastical properties and privileges, they agree to annul these questions, and to be guided in licensing, ordination, and installation, by the fundamental principles and regulations adopted by the Synod in 1830; and that they should not make this alteration, did it not leave them full power to ascertain that all persons obtaining admission into the Church, whether as licentiates or ministers, are believers in the Divine authority of Christianity.

We have already expressed our opinion that it might be prudent for the Synod to adopt the course now taken, and fall back on their original principles and practice, as embodied in the Code of Discipline adopted from the

General Synod. Many persons have been led to suppose, by the misrepresentations of certain writers and talkers, that they have thus abandoned the principle of questioning candidates for license or ordination, and have fallen into the ranks of those who repudiate the idea of ascertaining anything respecting the religious views of the candidate, and who maintain that they should, without inquiry, ordain any man whom a Congregation may choose. Nothing could be farther from the fact. By the Old Code the Presbytery was required to ascertain the soundness of faith of the candidate, either by "subscription to the Westminster Confession of Faith, or by such examination as shall be considered best adapted for that purpose." There was thus no limit to questioning.* Of course no candidate was ever asked by the Remonstrants to sign the Westminster Confession: no minister or congregation withdrawing from the General Synod held the characteristic views of that book; and besides, to have required such subscription would have been a violation of their principles. But the idea of licensing or ordaining a candidate without ascertaining his qualifications, both literary and *religious*, or of accepting him on his simply professing himself to be "a disciple of Christ," never entered into their mind. It has been stated that, previously to the introduction of the New Code, no questions were asked, or if they were, they were merely of a routine or formal character. Such is not the case. We have the evidence of almost every member of the Remonstrant Synod to prove the contrary; and we know that sometimes the ordaining minister tried the patience both of the Presbytery and the candidate by the minuteness of his interrogatories. It seemed desirable that a Directory should be drawn up by the Synod more suitable to their altered circumstances than the one which they had brought with them from their "house of bondage;" and accordingly great care was taken to compile

* We have seldom seen a more obstinate resistance to the plainest conclusions of the understanding than appears in the *London Inquirer* of the 7th ult., maintaining that the return of the Remonstrant Synod from a plain declaration of believing the truth of the Christian religion to a course requiring the candidate for license and ordination to subscribe twice over, and record in the Presbytery-Book a detailed statement of his religious opinions, is a return from Subscription to Non-Subscription.

that Code, which has been the source of so much discord and bitterness. We believe that in revising the regulations for licensing, ordaining, and installing ministers, their desire was to *increase the liberty* of the body by doing away with unlimited questioning of the candidate, and requiring him only to signify his acceptance of their charter principle—"the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament the only Infallible Rule of Faith and Duty," and his belief in God, and Christ, and the Divine Revelation contained in the Scriptures. This was certainly giving liberty enough, and we think that they committed a grave error in restricting themselves thus; for circumstances might arise that would render it prudent to know something more than such questions would elicit of the religious principles of the candidate. Be that as it may, the New Code certainly gave freedom enough in all conscience; but freedom beyond what a Christian conscience would seek for a minister had got into the heads of two or three Free-thinkers in the York Street Church; they seem to have inoculated their minister; and the *Truthseeker* and the *Bethbirei Magazine* afford painful evidence of the views that were entertained not only by laymen, but also by ministers in connexion with the Remonstrant Synod. To require one who aspired to be a minister of Christ's Gospel to signify his faith in the divine mission of the Saviour, seemed to these "men of progress" a terrible infringement of Christian liberty, and hence all the agitation and strife that sprung out of the adoption of the New Code. They argued that the Presbytery had no right to ask any questions; that it was the business of the Congregation alone to do so, if it felt inclined; to use the language of one of their advocates, "the best plan would be for the Presbytery simply to certify to the education, ability, and character of a candidate, and then to leave it entirely with the Congregation, for themselves to decide on the adequacy of his faith." The contest, then, was between *questioning* and *no questioning*, and to claim the recent change in the Remonstrant Synod as a triumph to their opponents is most unjust. That reverend body has not abandoned the right of satisfying themselves respecting the candidate's belief in Divine Revelation, and they distinctly declare, at the

close of the resolutions which they adopted, that "they would not have made the change, if it did not leave them full power to ascertain that all persons obtaining admission into their Church, whether as licentiates or ministers, are believers in the Divine authority of Christianity."

But why make any change at all, or why depart from the regulations which, after due deliberation, they had adopted, and which for years, amid much obloquy, they had maintained? If they believed that they secured the Christianity, and yet enlarged the freedom, of the church, why did they give them up? The reason is obvious, and most satisfactory. Their opponents had lately discovered that, by legal authorities, the questions in the code might be considered a violation of the principles of Non-Subscription, although in no just sense could they be so regarded, and forthwith the plan is entertained of attacking their funds and their meeting-houses. A secret committee, half lay and half clerical, half deistical and half Christian, broods over the scheme of spoliation, and by and by comes forth Mr. James Andrews, solicitor, and gives notice, for himself and others, that the Remonstrant Synod and Northern Presbytery of Antrim must abandon all interest in, or benefit from, the Rights of Conscience Fund—a fund which they had been mainly instrumental in creating. Intimation was also given that proceedings might be taken against various meeting-houses: and we think that when, without compromise of principle, they had it in their power to avoid expensive litigation, and baffle the attempt of those who most iniquitously sought, under the specious but desecrated name of "liberty," to plunder their property, they were fully justified in doing so. Had the question been between sacrificing the Christian principles for which they had so long battled, and losing their property, we believe they would have held by their principles and let their property go.

The great point in dispute between the two parties into which our Non-Subscribing Church is divided, still remains,—Shall we open our pulpits to those who deny, as well as to those who admit, the divine mission of our Lord? Some maintain that we should—and, judging from their newspapers, such is the prevailing opinion

of the English Unitarians: but the Remonstrant Synod as emphatically as ever contends that we should not.

The *London Inquirer* and *Manchester Herald*, which have throughout concerned themselves not a little in our discussions, have of course prominently noticed the late proceedings in the Remonstrant Synod. The *Inquirer* in an article possibly of Irish manufacture, certainly breathing the "Irish liberal" spirit, gives a one-sided and incorrect outline of "the Church in Ulster"—represents the Remonstrants as, through fear of the possibility of being deprived of their congregational properties, abandoning the testing clauses of their Code, while it omits to state that they gain more testing power by the step to which they have been driven; and seriously expresses its opinion, almost in so many words, that it would be an unpardonable neglect of duty on the part of the liberal party not to take all the meeting-houses and funds which the law would give them! Speaking in most insolent and contemptuous terms of the Remonstrant Synod and the Northern Presbytery of Antrim, it says that the Antrim Presbytery is "the only hope of liberal Christianity in the North of Ireland!" The tone of the whole article is that of the violent and unscrupulous partizan, and is in perfect harmony with its previous conduct in our controversy, in which its aim has been to screen the one party and misrepresent the other, making its columns a vehicle for continued attacks on some of the ablest men of our Church, and, on the plea of upholding Christian liberty, doing its best to trample down Christian truth.

The tone of *The Herald's* article is different: it assumes a tone of candour and generosity—and, consistent as a weathercock, it now seems to see no harm in "any amount of free questioning, originating in *bona fide* care that any candidate for ordination is fit for the office to which he aspires." "Such questioning," it adds, "is guided by the general feeling of the majority of the ordainers." Why, the great principle in dispute is—Have the ordainers any right to question? Till now *The Herald* maintained they had not, and on this ground, supported the advanced section in our church: and now it has strangely fallen into the views of the party which it had before abused! It alleges that it had never joined in

“the howl of execration” which has been kept up in some quarters against Dr. Montgomery’s party, meaning, we suppose, in *The Inquirer* and in our Irish Quarterly but our memory grievously deceives us if *The Herald* has not many a time echoed that howl. It speaks of bitter personal attacks levelled against it in *The Christian Unitarian*. Personal attacks we have endeavoured always to avoid; but sometimes in combating the very loose principles of which, to the disappointment of many friends, *The Herald* has been the apologist, we have found it necessary to expose the glaring inconsistency of its Editors, and especially of one who was formerly looked up to as a defender of Christian truth, but who has lately become, from time to time, the abettor of every principle and opinion that may by possibility extend the number of his party. What *The Herald* is pleased to call “the end of the Belfast disputes” is simply the end of the threatened lawsuits, by which its Irish friends had hoped to plunder their opponents and enrich themselves. The acknowledgement of the Divine Authority of Revelation is a principle which cannot be abandoned, and we see no prospect of peace till parties, so opposed in their views of church government, shall have formed into two distinct and *entirely separate* organizations.

AN ATTEMPTED EXPLANATION AND DEFENCE.

THE last number of *The Non-Subscriber*, just issued, contains an attempted explanation and defence of the extraordinary statement imputed to an “Elder of the Presbytery of Antrim,” and which, we proved in our October number, by the clearest and fullest evidence, was uttered in Girvan, by Mr. Robert M’Calmont. In a brief article in our last number, referring to Mr. M’Calmont’s promised defence, we had written the following as the concluding sentence, and afterwards drew our pen across it, thinking it needlessly severe:—“We beg to suggest to Mr. M’Calmont, that to *deny* is not to *disprove*, and that to make assaults upon others is not to vindicate himself.” Yet, just as we apprehended, Mr. M’Calmont has written an elaborate letter, extending over some five closely printed pages, in which he denies the allegation, but does not disprove it; and flings out most freely charges of conspiracy, calumny, and slander against the Rev. J. A. Crozier and the Rev. C. J. M’Alester. We regret that, to publish the lengthened reply of Mr. M’Calmont, is entirely beyond our power in the limited

space at our command. We shall, however, in a few sentences, give the substance of his defence, and then examine it.

Mr. M'Calmont begins with a complaint that we had refused insertion to his communication, and that he is therefore compelled to seek its publication in another journal instead of the one in which the charge against him appeared. He then goes on to state that the late Mr. Scott and he were perfectly agreed on the general doctrines of Unitarian Christianity, though differing on the abstract question of ecclesiastical liberty; that, on a visit to Girvan early in 1862, he had a conversation with several members of the Girvan Church on religious matters, and especially on the subject which then agitated the Church in Ulster; and that Mr. Scott was not prepared to adopt the principle of Free Inquiry as a bond of union, but contended for some test at the induction of ministers. He informs us that, while he accepts Christianity as the highest development of religious truth yet vouchsafed to man, he would not make even it binding by any imposition of belief, but would desire to see the question left open, adding that "Christianity, if true, cannot suffer from free inquiry, and if not true, the sooner we arrive at the fact the better." He then alleges that the Rev. J. A. Crozier, who shortly after visited Girvan, and discovered the impression Mr. M'Calmont's arguments had made on the friends there, hastened home, and informed Dr. Montgomery of the matter; and that presently a letter, since published as Mr. Scott's, was concocted in Ireland, and sent over to that gentleman for his signature. He attributes the composition of this letter to Mr. M'Alester, on the ground that the language employed by him in a speech at Ballyclare is identical with that of the letter.* He farther alleges that Mr. M'Alester urged Mr. Scott on to write the letter to Dr. Beard, and that, when some friend remonstrated with Mr. Scott not to send the letter, Mr. M'Alester, who was at his elbow, replied, "*Send it off. Not a bit too strong.*" He next introduces a letter from Mr. William Goudie, of Girvan, in which that gentleman expresses much regret for the differences that prevail among the brethren in Ulster; says that had he known in time, he would have endeavoured to prevent Mr. Scott from writing the letters to Mr. Crozier and Dr. Beard; that he does not recollect distinctly all that was said in the discussion in the School-room, but that there was much talk for talk's sake, with a considerable mixture of good solid argument, and that Mr. Scott pressed Mr. M'Calmont so far that he was forced to push the argument farther than he would be prepared to put into practice: but, strange as it may seem, he does not write a syllable which disproves Mr. Scott's statement, although that was the purpose for which Mr. M'Calmont applied to him. Mr. M'Calmont then alleges that there was design in withholding Mr. Scott's letter till after his death, and accuses Mr. M'Alester of going through the streets of Girvan with a written paper in his hand, looking for signatures to it, and argues that, if he had full faith in the letter Mr. Scott wrote when he was at his elbow, he would not have done so.

* In the sentences referred to there is no identity, and hardly as much similarity as might be expected in the same sentiment expressed by two independent persons.

We have thus given in a comparatively short space, but we believe most fairly, the substance of Mr. M'Calmont's defence. Let us examine his several statements and see what weight they bear. He leads the public to believe that *The Christian Unitarian* refused to insert his defence, and therefore, he published it in *The Non-Subscriber*. Had we done so, we would have acted most unjustly. So far, however, from acting thus, on receiving a short letter from him conveying a serious accusation against two respectable ministers, but giving no evidence to support it, we immediately wrote to him the letter published in our last number, saying that, if he furnished any statement with proof, we would publish it in full, and we gave him nearly a week to prepare it—the longest time we could possibly afford him. To allege, therefore, that we refused to publish any defence he might send us is a—mistake.

Mr. M'Calmont alleges that Mr. Scott and he were perfectly agreed on the general doctrines of Unitarianism. If by Unitarianism he mean the bald theory of "one God in one person," perhaps they were; for we think that when Mr. M'Calmont said that he would not exclude an Atheist from the pulpit, he admitted, under the pressure of his opponent's argument, more than he would be prepared to put into practice: but on the subject of Christian Unitarianism, Mr. Scott and he were utterly opposed. Mr. M'Calmont is an adherent of Parkerism or something worse, and by the expression of his wild opinions has often given surprise and pain: Mr. Scott was the very reverse, and in a brief letter published in *The Christian Unitarian* of January, 1862, he says:—"Should necessity arise for defending that faith which I hold dearer than life against Parkerism, taught under the Unitarian name, I will not shrink from the task. It seems high time that those who value the Christian Scriptures as a record of Divine Revelation should see to their position and speak out." A strange agreement that, between Mr. M'Calmont and his "particular friend" in the doctrines of Unitarianism!

It is said that there must have been design in withholding the letter till after Mr. Scott's death. No such thing. Dr. Montgomery was prepared to publish the whole matter, if it had been sought by any proper party, and, we may add, Mr. Scott was prepared to substantiate it. It was not our fault, but that of the officers of the Presbytery of Antrim, and others who, if they felt themselves aggrieved, should have demanded an explanation, and it would have been given as cheerfully and as fully then as it has been since. But, though with a pertinacity that must have seemed cruel, we kept the statement before them, we believe there was design, on the part of our opponents, in passing the statement unheeded till after Mr. Scott's death. We never for a moment doubted the truth of Mr. Scott's report, nor could any one who knew the high Christian principle that distinguished him in public and in private life; but when Mr. M'Alester heard Mr. M'Calmont make an outrageously incorrect statement respecting himself and Mr. Scott, at the Unitarian Society's meeting, in May, he deemed it prudent, on the occasion of his visit to Girvan soon after, to seek some corroborative evidence to prove the veracity of our departed

friend, if possibly it should be impugned. He spoke to three persons who were present. Mr. Goudie was the first whom he asked, if he recollected an extraordinary statement made by Mr. M'Calmont, in discussion with Mr. Scott, in their school-room, and he good-naturedly replied, that "he did not remember and did not wish to remember," evidently desiring, as he has stated in his letter to Mr. M'Calmont, that there should be nothing more of the matter. The two other parties willingly verified the statement, though they naturally desired that no use should be made of their evidence, unless it became necessary in vindication of Mr. Scott's character.

Mr. M'Calmont complains that the passages embodying the charge against him are mutilated and garbled documents. To meet this objection we have thought it best to publish the letter to Dr. Beard in full, as there is nothing in it but what is of a public nature. The first part of the letter to Mr. Crozier refers to matters comparatively private which we are unwilling to publish, although it will be seen, we have Mr. Crozier's authority for doing so; we reprint the part bearing on the question in dispute, and subjoin the verification of it by two respectable parties who were present. As we previously stated, Mr. Scott had told Mr. Crozier, when in Girvan, the views which Mr. M'Calmont had expressed, and he asked him for a written statement of them. The letter now quoted is in reply to that request:—

"GIRVAN, 3rd Dec., 1862.

"REV. AND DEAR SIR,— * * * In reference to the York Street Congregation, Mr. M'Calmont said it was their desire to build up a church which should not be exclusively Christian in any sense—which would admit Christians, Deists, Pantheists, Hindoos, Mohammedans. I said, 'why exclude Atheists.' He replied that Atheists would not be excluded, and that even if a minister became an Atheist, he thought he should not be required to resign. He thought the difference between Theism and Atheism was merely nominal, that a believer in the laws of Nature was a believer in God as much as the man who held the doctrine of a personal Deity. He said a minister should have perfect liberty to preach what he likes. Mr. M'Calmont did not speak in confidence, but seemed rather to challenge discussion on the subject, and stated his opinions very frankly. . . . I purpose writing a short article on Church Union among Unitarians for *The Christian Unitarian*, and I may probably refer to his views as pertaining to the New School.—I remain, Rev. and dear Sir, yours faithfully,

"MATTHEW SCOTT.

"Rev. J. A. Crozier, Ballymena."

"We have seen the letter of Mr. Matthew Scott to the Rev. J. A. Crozier, dated December 3, 1862, in which a report is given of statements made and opinions expressed by Mr. Robert M'Calmont in the School-room of the Girvan Unitarian Church. We were present on the occasion referred to, and we hereby certify that the report given by Mr. Scott is correct.—(Signed)

"JOHN COULTER,

"JOHN M'INTYRE.

"GIRVAN, May 13, 1863."

The extraordinary and most improbable supposition of Mr. M'Calmont, that the charges against him were concocted in Ireland, and

that the alleged extract of a letter to Mr. Crozier was drawn up by that gentleman and Mr. M'Alester, and sent over to Girvan for Mr. Scott's signature, might be sufficiently answered by the declaration of Messrs. Coulter and M'Intyre, who depose that they were present at the discussion in the School-room, and that Mr. Scott's letter contains a correct report of statements made and opinions expressed on that occasion by Mr. M'Calmont. But it is right that we should have the answers of Mr. Crozier and Mr. M'Alester to the foul and baseless charge brought against them.

" TO THE EDITOR OF THE CHRISTIAN UNITARIAN.

"DEAR SIR,—I have just read, in *The Non-Subscriber* for this quarter, Mr. M'Calmont's attempt to extricate himself from the disagreeable position he occupies in regard to the conversation reported in the letters of the late Mr. Scott, of Girvan. It is needless to say that the attempt is a transparent failure, as it was obvious it must be, in the face of the positive evidence in the case. I have to request, however, as Mr. M'Calmont desires it, that you will publish in full Mr. Scott's letter to me. I believe this course will more effectually dispose of the absurd charges and groundless insinuations contained in Mr. M'Calmont's letter than anything I could write. I am sorry I have not kept a copy of my letter to Mr. Scott, asking for the information, which I should have been happy to place entirely at Mr. M'Calmont's service; but I can assure him that Mr. M'Alester had nothing to say to it, and, I believe, was not cognizant of its having been written till some time after the reply had been received.

The statement that Mr. Scott's letter to me was concocted in this country, and sent over to him for signature, is simply *untrue*; and the plain admission contained in Mr. M'Calmont's and Mr. Goudie's letters, that such a conversation as there represented actually took place in Girvan, in Mr. Scott's presence, proves it to be a most gratuitous assumption, and a mere 'multiplication of causes without necessity.' Mr. M'Calmont need not think to turn attention from the *evidence against himself* by any such paltry quibbling. If he have no better means of escape than those he has yet had recourse to, I fear his case is hopeless.—I remain, faithfully yours,

"JOHN A. CROZIER.

" BALLYMENA, Nov. 24, 1863."

The following is Mr. M'Alester's statement:—

"I beg to state, in reference to the accusation brought against me of having prepared, or assisted in preparing, the extract of a letter alleged to have been written by Mr. Scott to Mr. Crozier, that I knew nothing of it till some time after it had been received by Mr. Crozier, and that I first learned its contents from Dr. Montgomery, in his speech at the Carrickfergus ordination, on December 30. With regard to the letter written by Mr. Scott to Dr. Beard, in which Mr. M'Calmont is referred to, I have to state that I knew nothing of it till more than six weeks after it had been written and forwarded. When I visited Girvan in February last, Mr. Scott read me a copy of it in his own house: he read it also to Mr. Callender, of Paisley, in that gentleman's parlour, on the following Monday, in my presence, and also in the house of a respectable lady in Paisley, to her and her family. It is quite possible that I may have expressed the opinion that it was "not a bit too strong," for I hold that opinion, and so I think will most persons who are acquainted with the Doctor's connexion with the

Herald and the principles which have been advocated in it: but when Mr. M'Calmont says that I was at Mr. Scott's side when he wrote it, and that I said, '*Send it off: it is not a bit too strong,*' he utters a pure fiction, and a foolish one too. The impressions Mr. Scott has given of Mr. M'Calmont's statements were written as they now exist, before I knew anything either from Mr. Scott or any one else on the matter.

"C. J. M'ALESTER.

HOLYWOOD, Nov. 24, 1863."

The foolish and absurd charge of conspiracy and fraud against Mr. Crozier and Mr. M'Alester is thus confuted by the direct testimony of these two gentlemen, as reliable, surely, as Mr. M'Calmont's supposition. It is also confuted by the evidence of two trustworthy parties who were present at the time Mr. M'Calmont gave utterance to the monstrous principles imputed to him. But if there were no other proof to expose his weak and wanton accusation against the ministers referred to, enough would be found in the character of Mr. Scott, whom more than once he speaks of in terms of apparent respect and esteem, but whose memory he strives to blacken in the vain hope of thus screening himself. Who that knew that honourable and Christian man, will believe that he would have lent himself to the wicked schemes of others, and put his name to a false statement concocted to defame even an enemy? Mr. M'Calmont was not his enemy; and the mean attempt to bring discredit on the fair fame and revered memory of the departed by so foul a calumny, is the worst feature in Mr. M'Calmont's laboured and artful attempt at a defence.

Other matters introduced in Mr. M'Calmont's letter, as the reference to "dodges" practised by the New School on the Old, at a certain Presbytery meeting, we pass over for the present as having nothing to do with the point in dispute, and as being calculated only to draw attention from it. On a calm review of the case, we think it must be evident to every one, whatever his views of Christian doctrine or of church government, that Mr. Robert M'Calmont, an Elder of the Presbytery of Antrim, and a Commissioner from the York Street Congregation when they sought admission into the Presbytery, declared to Mr. Scott and others in Girvan, not in confidence, but apparently with a wish that his sentiments should be known—that "it was the desire of himself and others, to build up a church which should not be exclusively Christian in any sense—which would admit Christians, Deists, Pantheists, Hindoos, Mohammedans;—and in which, even if a minister became an Atheist, he should not be required to resign."

And now a sentence or two in reply to the paragraph in which *The Non-Subscriber* ushers in Mr. M'Calmont's attempted defence. It alleges that Mr. Scott never gave currency to the statement under discussion at all, and that the fragments of letters published are "said to have been written" by Mr. Scott, insinuating that he never wrote them. Was Mr. Scott's written statement, sent to Mr. Crozier, not giving currency to it? and when, again and again, before different parties, he read his letter to Dr. Beard, was he not giving currency to it? And did not the intention expressed by him of embodying Mr. M'Calmont's statement in an article for *The*

Christian Unitarian, show that he contemplated giving yet further currency to it? If any doubt is entertained that these letters were written by Mr. Scott, we refer *The Non-Subscriber* to Mr. Crozier, who will show him the letter he received from Mr. Scott; or better still, to Dr. Beard who would be ready to afford him any information that he thinks might serve him. To say that the licentious principles expressed by Mr. M'Calmont, are held by all the Ministers or Elders of the Antrim Presbytery, would be very unjust; many of them would as heartily disclaim them as we would ourselves; but it is a painful truth that men of Mr. M'Calmont's stamp are among the most active of its agitators for "liberty;" and its Moderator has published to the world—a libel we hope many of its members feel it to be on their church—that the "only bond of union among them is Free Inquiry." *The Non-Subscriber* charges us with professing the highest respect for the Bible. So we do; but not more than our "liberal" brethren; for their eternal watchword is—"The Bible our rule of Faith." Why, Mr. M'Calmont himself, on an occasion and for a purpose, proposed to take the Bible as his "rule of faith," though the profession clashed so terribly with opinions elsewhere expressed; but we do not take that Holy Volume as the foundation of our church, and at the same time set at naught, or leave as "open questions," its most sacred facts and its most sublime doctrines.

LETTER TO THE REV. J. R. BEARD, D.D., MANCHESTER.

[An extract from the following letter of the late Mr. Scott, of Girvan, to the Rev. Dr. Beard, has been already published in an article in our October number, entitled "An Alleged Calumny;" but as that extract has been represented as being "garbled," and as all the matters touched on in the letter are of a public nature, we feel ourselves justified in publishing it in full.—ED. CH. UN.]

REV. AND DEAR SIR,—I duly received your note in which you recommend your forthcoming "Book of Family Devotion" as being in the direction which I like, and calculated to serve in checking certain extravagances.

I must say that I am truly sorry the editor of such a work should also be one of the editors of a journal which does its utmost to foster and diffuse such extravagances as those of Theodore Parker, and so to hasten the coming of that crisis in the Unitarian Church in England which years ago occurred in America, and recently in Ireland. When the *Herald* was first announced, some of the oldest and best tried friends in Scotland received the tidings with joy, your connexion with it being hailed as good news—a guarantee that Bible truth would be promoted and defended against the "New Theology." How sadly they have been disappointed you can hardly know. The *Inquirer* was regarded as an attempted

compromise between the *Old School* and the *New*. The *Herald* has become the *newest* of the *new*. The largest contributions to its pages have been such as were designed to weaken the authority of the Christian Scriptures, and to trumpet forth the prevalence of Parkerism in our midst. What more humiliating spectacle than that of a journal professedly Christian in its character and aims, (which takes offence at orthodox charges of unbelief brought against those whom it is supposed to represent), setting forth projects for Unitarianizing the masses *without the Bible*? And what cruel mockery, that eager issuing of that cheap edition of the works of Parker, (who derided Scripture, regarding its most important doctrine as a fiction,) under pretence of doing honour to the memory of two thousand noble witnesses to the truth of the divine authority of the Written Word.

But then, "Unitarians are bound by no creed." Well, that explains how diversity of opinion will exist amongst us; but it does not justify any one—editor any more than minister—for propagating doctrines which he deems false. If the Editors of the *Herald* believe in the Parkerism proclaimed through its columns, there is nothing wrong. They have, like others, the right to judge for themselves, and perhaps the right to call their religion by what name they please, although the origin of the term *Unitarian* (historically) would seem to forbid the application thereof to others than those who accept the Scriptures as their sole Rule of Faith, and acknowledge the divine mission of Jesus Christ. If, because Unitarians generally have no creed, any one may call himself *Unitarian*, and his belief or his unbelief *Unitarianism*, then "Iconoclast" may one day take his place by your side, and proclaim, as the newest and truest Unitarianism, his social science immoralities, which, if memory serves me right, you exposed and denounced very properly in the *Herald*. Indeed, if the Non-Natural interpretation of the term *Unitarian*, given by Mr. Martineau and others, is to be accepted, the Secularists have as good a title to our name as any class I know. They say they are "free inquirers"—they have no creed—(many of them no God, and are therefore all the more creedless). And let me tell you, if you are not already aware of the fact, that a pet Congregation of the New School has taken the initiative in this direction, bent on building up a Church which shall not be exclusively *Christian* in any sense, which shall welcome alike Deists, Pantheists, Atheists, men of all beliefs and of no belief, and whose minister shall be at liberty to preach Atheism from the pulpit if he choose, "because," say they, "the difference between Theism and Atheism is merely nominal, and to make belief in a personal God the basis of union would be virtually and actually to own a creed"! Who can deny that such is the only logical conclusion of the "Unitarian position" of Mr. Martineau and the "no creed" principle of the *Herald*. I mention the above, that you may see that out of England as well as in it "the work goes bravely on." It is no clamour. All I have said, and much more to the same effect, was stated to me in presence of several members of our Society in our vestry in February last. The Church referred to is York Street, Belfast; and my informant is Mr. M'Calmont, who

was Commissioner for said Church when it was admitted into the Antrim Presbytery. Had you heard from him, as I did, how the New School party "dodged" and deceived the Old at those Presbytery meetings, you would have blushed for the *Herald's* defence of that model *Christian Church*.

But you will ask, why this long epistle at all? My answer is, that I think the time has come for the humblest Christian Unitarian to speak out, and protest against the assumption of our name by deniers of Christianity, or if swamped, as I fear they shortly will be, to choose some other name, and some other bond of union than that of a mock liberty which only tempts the young to despise a definite faith and those who hold it, and produces strifes and jealousies as many and as bitter as does the strictest creed in Christendom. I am not without hope that you deplore, in some measure, the state of things which must drive earnest believers in Christ from us and into other churches, and that you may do good service by helping to set the *Unitarian Position Question* in its true light. By all means, let the Parkerites have a fair field. Let them and as many more as choose to speak out their inmost thoughts, be their views what they may, or how much soever they may be opposed to ours, form churches, proselytise, or do what they think right to improve and elevate themselves and others, and receive no injustice, no uncharitableness at our hand. Nay, when we find our opinions at one as to any good work to be done, let us work in harmony. But let no party fight or work under false colours. The Parkerites want true moral courage, notwithstanding their boldness sometimes. They know that Unitarians have gained a certain influence—that their name, although hated by many, is more respected than that of Deist, or Anti-Supernaturalist, or Rationalist, and hence their choice of a name. I am the more encouraged to address you, from knowing how warmly you protest against Scotch Presbyterians in England assuming the name "English Presbyterians," as a flagrant abuse of the term, because the latter were really English, and had their churches based on a peculiar foundation—that of open trusts—while the former were but Scotchmen residing in England, and are a close communion. If you are right in so strongly objecting to so free and loose an application of this name, notwithstanding that these Scotchmen really are Presbyterians, and English too in a sense, how far wrong must *The Herald* be in allowing the name Unitarian to rejectors of Christianity, in the face of the fact that that name was originally applied to those reformers in Hungary who, holding fast to Divine Revelation, rejected the doctrine of a Trinity because it was not taught by their Lord and Master.—Pardon the liberty I have taken. I am, Rev. and dear Sir, yours respectfully,

MATTHEW SCOTT.

GIBVAN, 22nd December, 1862.

INTELLIGENCE.

SPECIAL MEETING OF THE REMONSTRANT SYNOD.

On Tuesday, the 3rd ult., a special meeting of this reverend body was held in the First Meeting-House, Belfast, to consider sundry important matters affecting the interests of the Church. The Rev. James Callwell, Moderator, occupied the chair, and, after having constituted the Synod by prayer, read the requisition for the meeting. The Moderator's conduct in calling the meeting was approved.

The Rev. Dr. MONTGOMERY said—You are aware, my brethren, that it is unusual to hold meetings of Synod at this season of the year, and I have only deeply to lament that this meeting has been rendered necessary, not by any fault of ours, but in reality by that which I believe will eventually, in the estimation of all Christian men, redound to our credit. The Reverend Gentleman then detailed, in a very eloquent speech, the history of the Remonstrants—their secession from the General Synod—their organization as a distinct and independent Church, and the principles which they maintained. He also referred to the attacks made on various charitable funds and properties in this country and in England, and the successful efforts made by himself and others to procure the Dissenters' Chapels Act, which protected them from further spoliation. He proceeded to say—In the fundamental principles which we adopted in the year 1830, prudence and expediency compelled us to take with us from the General Synod of Ulster a code of discipline belonging to that body, which we had helped to form in 1825. Some of us, and myself in particular, did not very much like that code, but, with others, I yielded to the esteem and experience of the good men with whom I acted, and concurred in adopting it; and that code provided the modes of ordaining candidates for the ministry, and of installing ministers. There were two modes. The first required from the candidates for the ministry absolute subscription to the "Westminster Confession of Faith," with its whole 33 chapters and its 174 pages. That was the first plan. But there was an alternative, and it was on the ground of that alternative that we agreed to bring that code with us, because it left us the power to ordain a minister simply by his stating that he accepted the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament as containing a Divine revelation, and by his answering such questions as would test his knowledge of the principles contained in these Scriptures. I, with many others, felt deeply for years that that was an anomalous state of things, and unworthy of a Church glorying in its non-subscription, and we determined to modify our code of discipline in that respect; and instead of having the Westminster Confession of Faith, or unlimited questioning by Presbyteries, which might be capricious, or might be tyrannical or vexatious, to confine ourselves to three questions not involving the peculiarities

of any Church, but which have ever lain, and must always lie, at the foundation of Christianity. We simply agreed to ask a man who professed to do God's work—"Do you believe in one God, the Creator and Governor of the universe?" The second question was—"Do you acknowledge the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament to contain a Divine revelation?" We did not ask the candidate did he believe in their plenary inspiration, but did he believe that they contained a Divine revelation. And the last question was—"Do you believe in the Divine mission and authority of the Lord Jesus Christ as the Son of God and the Saviour of the world?" Now, brethren, we felt that a man professing to be a Christian minister would not hesitate to acknowledge Christ, and to profess belief in His Divine mission and authority; and we substituted these three questions for the Westminster Confession of Faith, and for the other mode provided by the code, by which questions might be put to almost an unlimited extent. It was in consequence of this proceeding that the yell was raised that I desired to restrict the liberties of the people, and to trample upon the rights of licentiates, when all I desired was that they should be Christian freemen. We desire to restrict the liberties of no man. God forbid we should. We have no objection whatever to a congregation choosing a man to teach themselves and their children, who may be an Atheist—a denier of the existence of a God—though we regret that such a thing could occur—who may be a Pantheist, who declares that everything is God, that the pillars of this church and every person here and everywhere are parts of the Great Being—or a Deist, who admits the existence of God, but denies the Divine authority of Christ. We have no objection to a congregation choosing such a man, but we object to him being chosen as a Christian teacher. There must be two parties to such a bargain, and the Presbytery who ordains is one of them. We interfere in no way with the people. It is their indisputable right and privilege to have any man they may choose; but when they come to us and say, "We want you to ordain him," we say, our ordination implies that we give him a certificate to the world that he is a Christian man—to the Government of the country that he is a Christian, and, as a Christian teacher he is to receive an endowment from the State; our ordination admits him into all the privileges of the Church; we give him power over our students, and over our Congregations. Then comes the other question—Are we compelled to give a certificate to a man that he is a Christian—to receive the money of a Christian state—to place him as a teacher over our students who are being brought up to the profession of the ministry—without knowing that he is a Christian? The proposition is monstrous; and how any congregation can demand that we should ordain any man—though he might not know the very rudiments of Christianity—is monstrous before God and the world. Well, this is "the head and front of my offending"—that I will not ordain men that will not acknowledge themselves to be Christians; and for this I am called an inquisitor, a persecutor, a tyrant, a dishonourer of the name of good and worthy men, a renegade, a traitor—in fact, everything except a thief or a murderer. Now, I would have

thought very little of all this, coming from my orthodox brethren, who may have a conscientious feeling that I was greatly in error; but the stigma has come lately from our own dearest friends—from the very men who co-operated with us, and whose property we saved by being largely instrumental in obtaining the passing of the Dissenters' Chapels Act; and I know of nothing so monstrous in the whole history of any Church as that men, who boast of their adherence to the rights of conscience and free inquiry, should turn round upon us as they have done. They say, "You have the right of private judgment, but that right of judgment does not concur with us. You must turn out from your meeting-houses and properties. We are the proper owners." I declare that in the history of the Church there is nothing equal to this. If I had laboured for ten years to prove what are the principles of these men—to prove that when they talk of order, they mean tyranny—that when they talk of the rights of property, they mean spoliation and oppression of conscience—if I had laboured for ten years, I could not have shown more effectually their principles than they have done themselves. I do not know whether they may be able to rob us or not; but the will is not wanting, for I have read a publication in which it is contended that every meeting-house and every fund should be taken from us; and more especially that this very house should be wrested from the people who built it and ornamented it so beautifully—from the ministers who have adorned it by their intelligence, their character, their moral worth, and their Christian sanctity. Oh, these are frightful things to have occurring in any Church, but more especially in a Church which affects to be the citadel of liberty and the great proclaimer of liberty of conscience. Now, you will hardly understand how this storm has got up against us. It is six years since our Code of Discipline was passed, and whatever was bad in it was as well known then as now; yet these gentlemen co-operated with us quite fairly in the Non-Subscribing Association, and otherwise, for the education of our students and the promotion of our common cause. But a dispute arose in the Presbytery of Antrim, and that dispute was brought before a Court in Dublin. I have no idea of speaking disrespectfully of the Queen's representative in the Rolls Court in Dublin, but I will read to you that in which these attacks upon our property are founded. [Dr. Montgomery then read an extract from a statement by the Master of the Rolls to the effect that the questions amounted to a creed]. Now, it would not become me to dispute what a judge on the bench says; but there have been weak and foolish judges on the bench; and if ever an absurd position was put before the world, it is to say that it is a creed to ask a man who is to become a Christian preacher, who is to be ordained a Christian minister, whose duty it will be to preach Christ, and Him crucified—to ask him if he believes in Jesus Christ. I believe that such a statement is an intense absurdity. The same principle he applies to the existence of a God. That is the foundation of all religion. It is the foundation of the religion of the Bible, of the religion of Nature, of the religion of Mahomet. To tell me that it is a human creed to ask a man if he believes in God! I spurn it as a misinterpretation

and misrepresentation of all language. The judge further seems to approve of the question of belief in the Scriptures as involving no human creed, and he says:—"I will give over to certain people the property of their friends and neighbours; £1,800 worth of property to those who never contributed £50 to it, because they hold a principle that involves no religious belief at all." Now, I do not say that that may not be law; but if it is, it is directly opposed to all common sense and all common justice. Now, it is upon this ground that we are to be assailed in our properties. If I had time I might read you the atrocious things that are contained in that infamous pamphlet called *The Non-Subscriber*, for August last—that infamous pamphlet that powerfully advocates robbery and plunder, that to a very large extent, from beginning to end, advocates infidelity. There is scarcely an article in it that is not, more or less, coquetting with infidelity, or directly wedding it. The people who have circulated this pamphlet have poisoned the minds of respectable laymen, who have been deceived. I do not blame the great body of the laity. I only lament that they have been such fools as to put themselves into the hands of such men. I do not blame those who have been deluded by these cries of liberty. I have said a good deal about liberty myself, but there is a great difference between their liberty and mine. Did I ever advocate liberty for a man to go into a Christian pulpit to preach down Christianity? Did I ever advocate a Presbytery putting hands on a man and designating him before God and the world as a Christian, of whose opinions they knew nothing? God forbid. We were not enlightened enough in those times to think that liberty implies a denial of the Gospel. They have now determined to attack our property, and I know not whether a judge might not be found to give them aid in doing so. A judge who could give out such a document as I have read might very readily decide that my meeting-house and property, worth about £1,000 to myself and my people, really belonged to somebody who had not contributed a farthing to it. It would not be a whit more absurd than what he has said, and therefore it is far better for us not to leave ourselves open to these things. It is far better that we should, to a certain extent, retrace our steps, and put ourselves in a position in which there will be no plea of law; no quibble against us; no protracted Chancery Suit. It is far better that we should retrace our steps than subject ourselves to this, when we can do it with a safe conscience before God and before the world. To tell you the truth, I am very much afraid of Chancery lawsuits. I am very much afraid of an expenditure of six or seven or ten hundred pounds. I am very much afraid of the opinions of lawyers and judges, for I believe that there is no place where more injustice has often been done than in courts of law. Therefore I desire that we should keep ourselves as far as possible out of the power of these men who, declaring that they respect conscience, would rob us of our dearest property—our meeting-houses, our graveyards, and our sacred funds that we have raised for the support of struggling ministers, and all for the crime of differing from them upon a question of Church discipline. Many of the good men whom they have deluded, many of the respectable

farmers over the country, many of the bankers and merchants of the town of Belfast, whom they have deceived by the clamour about liberty, will now see the kind of individuals to whom they have given their countenance; and I believe, while they have served us with notice to rob us of our property, they will be grievously disappointed. I, therefore, move, and submit for your consideration—

“The question of certain legal difficulties having been brought before Synod in regard to the provisions of our New Code of Discipline in relation to the licensing of candidates for the ministry, and the ordination and installation of ministers, it was—

“Resolved—That, in adopting the three simple questions to be affirmately answered by candidates for license and ordination, as contained in page 17 of our said New Code, enacted in the year 1857, our design was to *enlarge*, and not to *restrict*, the Christian liberties both of congregations and ministers.

“That we *did* not, and *do* not, consider those three questions as involving, in any way, the adoption of a human creed, the enforcing of which would be at utter variance with all our principles and practice.

“That we devoutly adhered, and continue to adhere, to the great principles of religious liberty on which we separated from the General Synod of Ulster and established the Remonstrant Synod.

“Nevertheless, inasmuch as certain legal interpretations of our three questions might possibly imperil certain of our ecclesiastical properties and privileges, we hereby publicly omit the three questions contained in page 17 of our New Code of Discipline, and declare that in future we shall be guided solely, in the matter of licensing, ordination, and installation, by the fundamental principles and regulations adopted by our Synod, at its first meeting in the year 1830.

“Resolved—That we should not make this alteration in our laws, did it not leave us full power to ascertain that all persons obtaining admission into our Church, whether as licentiates or ministers, are believers in the divine authority of Christianity.”

Rev. ALEX. ORR (Ballyhemlin)—I rise to second the resolution which Dr. Montgomery has now proposed. We all rejoice, I am sure, notwithstanding our difficulties in the Church, to see Dr. Montgomery this day, and to find that his mind is as vigorous and acute as in the palmiest days of his life—that, notwithstanding the troubles he has had, and the great labours that he has come through in our cause, he is still able to speak with the same eloquence by which he was characterised at the time of his great struggles. When these questions were under discussion in this Synod, I voted that they should become a part of our Code of Discipline. My impression at that time, and I expressed myself to that effect, was, that one of these questions was all that was necessary; that, if we acknowledge the Scriptures to be a revelation from God we involve the other two. I had hoped at that time that these questions would have got an opportunity of being worked in our Church. I do not believe that these three questions are a human creed. They are not deductions nor inferences of men on certain given data and acknowledged principles, but they are the data and the acknowledged principles themselves. There is not one of our opponents that has not at least complied with one question. The great argument is that the Presbytery has no right to propose these questions, and the consequence

of that would be, to deprive the Presbytery of the right to ascertain the Christian qualifications of those candidates whom they are asked to send to the world with their *imprimatur*. Notwithstanding all these things, hoping that we will act more harmoniously, and that we will be more disposed than hitherto to keep "the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace," I second the resolution which Dr. Montgomery has proposed.

Rev. J. M'CAW (Killinchy) begged to dissent from that portion of the resolution which said that the three questions were not a creed. He believed that they meant a creed, and he dissented from that portion of Dr. Montgomery's resolution. If a person adhered to the fundamental principles of the Church, he was a Christian; therefore he did not see the use of the questions at all.

Rev. H. ALEXANDER (Newry) believed that the revision of the code, with which he had nothing to do, was undertaken in good faith. There was no difference about the propriety of putting some questions: the only discussion was as to what the questions should be, and these three questions were adopted after discussion. He agreed with Mr. Orr, that the second question comprised the other two; still he maintained that these questions were not a human creed, in the sense their fathers understood a creed; and, in going back to the ground they occupied previously, the Synod did not at all say that the questions were a creed. It might be said he was presumptuous in setting himself up in opposition to the opinions of a Judge; but he would set himself up in opposition to a Judge, and say that he knew more about what Non-Subscription was, and what a creed was, than any Judge on the bench. The subject was evidently perfectly new to the Judge, and he had spoken accordingly upon it. There was nothing inconsistent in adopting the resolution now proposed. He understood that the resolution gave him the perfect liberty that the questions gave him, and would not at all limit him in putting these questions, if a case arose. They now adopted the fundamental principles, and one of these is the old code of discipline, and by it the Presbytery could put as many questions as they thought necessary; and, if the answering would not be satisfactory, he would decline to join in the ordination of any such man. There is no doubt those who oppose these questions will claim this as a victory, and so it is a victory. They have brought the law so to bear upon us, that they have a victory. With respect to their attacks upon Dr. Montgomery, I only hope that, when they have spent their mind and vigour, as he has done, in the service of the Church, they will not be vilified and abused, as the lion of their tribe has been, and that they will show even a small amount of the services he has shown. If their opponents would agree to ordain any man that offered, they would be understood; but their present position he thought was preposterous.

The Rev. T. SMYTH said, let them cease to call each other robbers and infidels, and they would agree better. The one side shouted "tyrant," and the other "infidel," and, so long as that was the case, he had no hope of peace.

Rev. R. CAMPBELL (Templepatrick) said he did not wish to retrace his steps, and there was not a vote he had recorded that he

would not record again under the same circumstances. His opinion in opposition to that of a lawyer would have small weight, but he believed that if they thought it worth while to go to law, their property would be protected for them. It would be found that they had not violated one single principle of their Church, and he believed these three questions were exactly the thing that this Church required. He submitted to this resolution because it left him the right in Presbytery to put the same questions, or any others he chose.

Rev. W. CROZIER (Rademon) fully coincided with Mr. Campbell. The questions were passed by a majority, and after full consideration; and, instead of being ashamed of these questions, they should, as a Christian Church, glory in them. He should never recede from them, and, if he supposed that this new resolution that the Synod was about to adopt would curtail his liberty in the slightest degree of putting these questions on any occasion he might require to do so, he would oppose this resolution to the utmost of his power. He would give no opposition to the passing of the resolution, as it might be necessary in a legal point of view to pass it, although he would still adhere in spirit to the principles laid down in the Code of Discipline.

Rev. JOHN ORR (Comber) said he always believed that these questions did not comprise a human creed; still, he thought it desirable that they should be annulled, and he believed the result of the change would be satisfactory, and tend to the pacification of their Church.

The Rev. JOHN MONTGOMERY (Banbridge) said that it was their opponents, and not themselves, who had shifted their ground; for at first they all agreed that one or two questions should be put.

The resolution was unanimously adopted, Mr. McCaw dissenting from that part which implied that the three questions are not a creed.

The Synod then took up the case of the Carrickfergus Congregation—the want of Students for the Ministry in their Church—and the desirableness of a Library for Students.

THE BALLYCLARE CASE.—ROLLS COURT.

[His Honour, the Master of the Rolls, delivered Judgment on 3rd November in this case, but it is impossible for us to record it in detail. We can only publish the ruling of the Case at the end of the Judgment,—the whole has been reported at length in the newspapers.]

The best course, I think, for the Court to adopt will be to declare on the order the opinion of the Court on the several questions raised. I shall, therefore, declare, that the Congregation of Ballyclare became connected with the Presbytery of Antrim, in or about the year 1726, upon the principles known in the Presbyterian Church of Ireland as the principles of Non-subscription. It will not be necessary in this case to declare those principles more fully, and I am unwilling to decide anything not absolutely necessary, the Presbytery of Antrim not being the parties to the suit, and a pre-

cise declaration on the face of the order that the six propositions in the expedients for peace were adopted by the Presbytery of Antrim, might affect that Presbytery and other congregations with which it is connected. The relators can scarcely require that I should make such a declaration where the Northern Presbytery of Antrim, with which the majority of the Congregation of Ballyclare has sought to connect itself, has not adopted all those six propositions. I shall next declare that the majority of the Congregation of Ballyclare were not entitled, at their will and pleasure, and without any just cause, to withdraw the said congregation from the Presbytery of Antrim, and to join the Northern Presbytery of Antrim, without the assent, and contrary to the wish of the Rev. John Hall, the minister of the said congregation. I shall further declare, that the Presbytery of Antrim having acceded to the memorial of the York Street Congregation, Belfast, and taken the said congregation under its care, did not justify the resolution of the majority of the Congregation of Ballyclare of the 2nd of February, 1862, to withdraw from the Presbytery of Antrim without the assent of their minister. I shall further declare, that the installation of the Rev. J. Jellie on the 5th February, 1862, did not, under the circumstances of this case, justify the majority of the Congregation of Ballyclare in withdrawing the said congregation from the Presbytery of Antrim without the assent of their minister. I shall further declare, that the decision of the Presbytery of Antrim, refusing to receive, on the 6th of November, 1861, more than one elder from the Congregation of Belfast, and receiving Mr. William Adamson as the elder from the Congregation of Ballyclare on the 6th of November, 1861, and refusing to receive Mr. William Dundee as elder from said congregation, did not justify the majority of the said congregation in withdrawing, without the assent of their said minister, the said congregation from the Presbytery of Antrim. I shall decline to decide whether the persons in the petition mentioned were the legally appointed committee of the said congregation, and shall also decline to decide whether the respective officers in the said petition named were duly appointed to their respective offices, the Court being of opinion that the Presbytery with which the said congregation is legally connected is the proper tribunal to decide such matters. I shall further declare that the Congregation of Ballyclare is legally connected with the Presbytery of Antrim, and is not legally connected with the Northern Presbytery of Antrim. I shall order the relators to pay the costs of this suit, and I shall reserve liberty to the parties to apply as they may be advised. As to the other suit instituted by the Rev. Mr. Hall, in consequence of the illegal proceedings of locking him out of the meeting-house, I shall continue the injunction, and direct the respondents to pay the costs of that suit. I have abstained, for obvious reasons, from expressing any opinion as to the doctrine of Non-subscription.

MEETING OF NON-SUBSCRIBING LAITY.

We learn from *The Non-Subscriber*, that a meeting of lay members of the Non-Subscribing denomination of Presbyterians was held in

Belfast, on Sunday, the 15th ult.,—James Heron, Esq., in the chair,—at which, on the motion of Wm. B. Ritchie, Esq., seconded by Robert Gordon, Esq., resolutions were adopted to the effect—that they regretted the dissensions that have for some years existed in the denomination; that the recent Judgment of the Master of the Rolls, in the Ballyclare Case, proves that an aggression on the religious liberties of the churches was only frustrated by an appeal to a Court of Equity; that to prevent a like occurrence in future, a committee of laymen be appointed to watch over the liberties of the Church and protect the rights of the laity from clerical aggression, and that a fund be raised by subscription, to be placed at the disposal of the Committee for carrying out the objects referred to. A number of names is then given of gentlemen to be requested to act as a Standing Committee. W. B. Ritchie was appointed Secretary, and was requested to communicate, by circular, the objects of the Committee to every congregation in Ulster connected with the denomination.

[We are not informed where the meeting referred to was held, how it was convened, or who were present: for anything we are told to the contrary, there may have been no one present except the chairman, and the mover and seconder of the resolutions. Whether the gentlemen named as a Committee will consent to join in an organization to create dissension in the Non-Subscribing Congregations of Ulster remains to be seen; but even if they do, we do not fear the result. *The London Inquirer* lately remarked that “the Antrim Presbytery is the only hope of Liberal Christianity in the North of Ireland.” But when it wrote thus, it could not have known anything of this new association; for certainly Christianity, in its purest and most liberal form, is sure to prosper under the patronage and guardianship of Mr. James Heron.—ED. CH. UN.]

WESTERN UNITARIAN CHRISTIAN UNION.

The autumnal meeting of this Society was held at Merthyr Tydvil, on Wednesday, October 29, and was largely attended. The services were introduced by the Rev. E. Chapman, of Bristol, and the Rev. E. Higginson, of Swansea, preached an excellent sermon from Matt. ix. 23. It considered the question—What faith had to do with the Gospel Miracles? He alluded pointedly to the “avowal lately made by some who assume to be representatives of the Unitarian body, that the miracles of Jesus Christ might be regarded as an open question.” He claimed as a true Christian glory of our free churches, the fact that they have always been able to shelter and comfort men of less distinctly Christian convictions; but insisted that the question of a miraculous Christ and Christianity, though always an open question in the world, could not, in the nature of things, be so in the church, any more than gravitation among Newtonians, or monarchy in England. “The brave men who once set up a commonwealth did not insist upon being called royalists.” To be a Christian is to believe in a Christ; and a Christ, or “anointed,” means (behind the Jewish figure)

"the power of God and the wisdom of God." Renan, in his "Life of Jesus," intuitively perceives the impropriety of speaking of him as Christ, and would be astonished, and not complimented, to be called a Christian. And "that great, good, and brave man, Theodore Parker," never, perhaps, did an unmanly thing, except in showing himself grieved to be taken at his word respecting the "absolute religion," and "querulously insisting on being called a Christian."

After the services, about seventy ladies and gentlemen partook of a cold collation—Charles H. James, Esq., in the chair. The report of the Committee was read by the Rev. W. James, and appropriate sentiments were responded to by several gentlemen, lay and clerical. In the evening the Rev. W. James delivered a lecture to a crowded audience.

RESIGNATION OF A CHURCH OF ENGLAND CLERGYMAN.

We learn from the newspapers that the Rev. P. Jones, Incumbent of Hindley, near Wigan, has resigned his living, on the ground that he could no longer declare his unfeigned assent and consent to all and everything contained in and prescribed by the Church's Book of Common Prayer. He particularly referred to the Athanasian Creed, the Baptismal Service, the Service for the Visitation of the Sick, the Burial Service, and the Ordination Service.

OBITUARY.

Died, on November 2nd, at Comber, County Down, Agnes, wife of John Miller, Esq.

Died, on Monday, the 2nd of November, at Murray Terrace, Belfast, Rosabella, daughter of Richard Rothwell, Esq., R.H.A., aged 14 years.

Died, on Tuesday, the 17th of November, at his house in Donegall Square West, Belfast, James Campbell, Esq., formerly of Springfield, aged 79 years. He was distinguished, throughout life, by unswerving integrity, combined with genial kindness of heart and earnest but unobtrusive Christian piety. No man could be more loving or beloved in the circle of his family, or the wider circle of the friends who were drawn to him by the experience of his virtues: and none can be more deeply regretted. His life was gentle, and his end peaceful. "*Let me die the death of the righteous, and let my latter end be like his.*"

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

Continuation of "Congregational Memoirs," conclusion of "What is Christianity," and other Articles held over for want of space.

Communications for the Editor, to be addressed, by post, to the Rev. C. J. McAlester, Holywood; or, otherwise, to 45, Arthur Street, Belfast.

THE
CHRISTIAN UNITARIAN.

VOL. II.]

JANUARY, 1864.

[No. 12.]

NOTES ON THE BALLYCLARE CASE.

It is not probable that the Ballyclare Case will again be brought before a court of law; and it seems to us important that certain misapprehensions which exist should be removed from the public mind, and that the proceedings of those members of the Old Congregation of Ballyclare, who, by a process of law, have been deprived of their congregational property and privileges, should be placed in their true light.

The public will be led to believe, from a passage in the Master's Judgment, that the installation of the Rev. J. Jellie, as minister of the York Street Congregation, was the main cause of the secession of a portion of the people of Ballyclare from the Presbytery of Antrim: whereas the ground of their withdrawal was, that their congregational rights had been trampled on by the Presbytery, the ancient usages of the body had, in their mind, been cast aside, and a principle distinctly avowed, which would open the pulpits of its churches to unbelievers. To Mr. Jellie they never expressed and never entertained any objection; and if they disapproved of the resolution for his installation, it was that it was adopted with the understanding that the choice of the people was supreme, and that the installing ministers were bound to appoint any one whom the Congregation might choose, without any inquiries respecting his Christian belief.

They complained that their congregational rights had been shamefully violated in the rejection of the Elder who, both by a vote of the Session, and by a subsequent vote of the Congregation, had been regularly appointed; and in the reception of another party, who had no claim to represent the Congregation. Such a gross violation of

their rights was in itself sufficient to give them great offence and rouse them to a strenuous opposition; but it was especially painful to them, as it became evident that the object of the majority of the Presbytery, in rejecting the regularly appointed Elder, and admitting another party, was to gain an additional vote, and thus secure the admission of the York Street Congregation. They felt that in a body which could thus, to carry a particular measure, set aside the claims of a Congregation, their rights were not safe; and they therefore resolved to form some other Presbyterian connection. It should be borne in mind, that from this act of petty tyranny there was no appeal; and the Congregation must either submit or leave the body. The step which they took must meet the approval of all haters of ecclesiastical oppression, whatever be the Church to which they belong.

But this act of gross injustice, in refusing to receive the venerable Elder from the Ballyclare Congregation, was only, as we have said, a means to an end. The York Street Congregation, through Mr. Robert M'Calmont and other commissioners, sought admission to the Presbytery, with the explicit understanding that whatever person the Congregation should choose, the Presbytery would ordain without making any inquiry respecting his doctrinal belief. To such a course it was known that some of the leading members of the body would object, including the two eldest of the brethren; and it was important to gain all the votes that could *per fas et nefas* be secured; and hence the reception of a representative elder from Ballyclare, who had no claim upon the office, save only his willingness to be the tool of the majority. In admitting the York Street Congregation on the very liberal terms which we have stated, and in rejecting a motion brought forward at a subsequent meeting of Presbytery for the purpose of counteracting the mischievous course which had been introduced, and of vindicating the Christian character of the body, the people of Ballyclare, with many others in other congregations, believed that the original principles and the ancient practice of the Presbytery had been abandoned; and therefore, for the protection of themselves and their children, they resolved to withdraw from ecclesiastical connexion

with them. We are aware that, partly through the very imperfect minutes which were made of the Presbytery's proceedings for many years, and partly through the plausible sophistries of certain ministers, many have been led to believe that, according to the constitution of the Presbytery of Antrim, congregations have an absolute right to require the ordination of any person whom they may choose, no matter what his principles may be. It would be very easy to show, by numerous quotations from the writings of the founders of the Presbytery, that they held no such loose and wild opinions. Thus, on the controversy which was waged respecting Non-Subscription at the time the Presbytery was being formed, Mr. Haliday, the most prominent advocate of the Presbytery's principles, writes—

“I am, in my judgment, convinced that ministers ought carefully to try every man whom they admit to that sacred office: and it would be to me a much more satisfying proof that a man is apt to teach the doctrine contained in the Bible, if in his own words he would draw up a short abridgment of that doctrine, than if he would subscribe to the words of the Bible.”

And again he writes—

“I never have pleaded that any man ought to be ordained who has not given to his ordainers sufficient proofs of his holding the faithful word taught by Christ and his apostles, and of his aptness to teach the doctrine of the Gospel.”

What surprise and sorrow would fill the minds of Haliday and Abernethy, Bruce, Nevin, and others, if they could see those who assume to hold their principles, bringing Non-Subscription into ridicule and disgrace, by making it an apology for the wildest scepticism and the grossest unbelief! The people of Ballyclare had, therefore, the strongest grounds for separating from the Presbytery. They did not act under a momentary excitement, but calmly and deliberately, from a deep sense of duty; and the cheerful spirit in which they bear the terrible defeat which they suffered in the Rolls Court, and the noble resolve with which they maintain their position, show that they value their principles, and are willing to suffer for them.

It should be carefully noted, that the Master of the Rolls represents the seceding party again and again as the

majority of the Congregation of Ballyclare. All who know the neighbourhood are fully aware that they are the large majority, comprising, in numbers, social position, and intelligence, the best part of the Congregation. But we know that in other quarters a very different report of the comparative strength of the two parties has been given. Thus the resolution for withdrawing from the Presbytery, adopted on February 2, 1862, was signed by *sixty-three* seatholders at the meeting; and there were added afterwards the names of *twenty* other seatholders or stipend-payers, who had not been present, making in all *eighty-three*. A protest against this resolution was signed by *thirty-four* seatholders qualified to vote. The names are given in an appendix to the "Memorial" which was addressed to the Lord Lieutenant, and afterwards published. It would appear that a copy of this Memorial had been sent to a leading minister of the Unitarian denomination in London, for the purpose, we may presume, of disabusing his mind of false impressions respecting the Ballyclare Case which, by the *London Inquirer* and by private communications, had been made on his mind. But by and bye, a minister of the Presbytery of Antrim, more zealous than discreet, wrote to this London minister, informing him that of the *eighty-three* names attached to the resolution for leaving the Presbytery, more than one-half had been fraudulently inserted; and to verify his statement, he enclosed a certificate from a Belfast attorney! This statement was glaringly untrue, as any one acquainted with the Congregation could have proved; but it was also absurd, as, if there had been fraud, it could easily have been detected: but yet, by such a report, it was hoped to blind the clergyman referred to, justly influential from his abilities, worth, and position, and conceal from him the real state of the case. Now, in whatever other respects the Master of the Rolls has been against us, he has admitted, perhaps reluctantly, that the seceding party are the majority, and has thus exposed the misrepresentation which we have noticed. Accident has enabled us to detect one gross misstatement,—what others may have been made to win sympathy and aid for Mr. Hall and his party, we have no means of ascertaining.

With the admitted fact that the party opposed to Mr.

Hall are the large majority of his Congregation, let us turn to the letter of that gentleman, addressed to the *Inquirer* in June last, in which he says—

“I trust I have sufficient respect for public opinion, and a proper regard for the rights of the laity, not to be indifferent to the voices of my people, when fairly and legitimately expressed; and I can now conscientiously say that, had I been assured by reasonable evidence that any considerable portion of my Congregation had any just cause for dissatisfaction with my principles or my conduct, I would most certainly have resigned my ministerial office in acknowledgment of the legitimate authority of the people.”

Not merely “a considerable portion,” but the large majority, of Mr. Hall’s Congregation have given their voice “fairly and legitimately” against him. We would therefore suggest to him, that he should prove his “respect for public opinion” and his “regard for the rights of the laity,” by retiring from an office in which his usefulness is gone. He knows that those who are dissatisfied with him, represent the parties who have created all the church property of the congregation; and although a legal decision has declared that they are no longer members of the congregation, he is aware that justice is superior to law, and that in justice they are entitled to a voice in its affairs. Mr. Hall has only to look at this matter from the stand-point which his Presbytery has assumed—the *Presbytery a mere court of order and the wishes of the people supreme*—and he will see his course of duty as plainly as we could mark it out.

If the committee nominated at a meeting of some persons, held somewhere on November 15th, under the presidency of Mr. James Heron, “to protect the rights of the laity from clerical aggression and unlawful interference,” have undertaken the important work assigned to them, we respectfully beg that they may give their earliest attention to the Ballyclare Case. The rights of the people have been ruthlessly trampled on, the minister has been deaf to advice or remonstrance, has played the part of a tyrant, and contemptuously told them he would preach what he liked; the Presbytery has insulted them in the rejection of their elder, and then required that they should follow it, no matter how it may violate the principles on which it is based; and, lastly, by a decision

of the law courts, they have been deprived of the church and manse—the former inherited from their fathers, but greatly improved by them—the latter erected by their own contributions. To what case could this committee better direct their first efforts? They would thus satisfy the public that their appointment is not a sham, but a reality, and that they have taken office, not under the plea of liberty, to promote dissension in congregations, and foster scepticism, but really “to protect the rights of the laity.”

WHAT IS CHRISTIANITY?

(Concluded from p. 343.)

THE replies which we have given to the question before us have not only a positive value; they furnish also an exposure of the misstatements to which many in the community lend a ready ear. We will extend this article only so far as to notice two or three such examples.

We are charged with undervaluing revelation, and of placing it on the same ground of authority with reason. We have, on the contrary, made the broadest distinction between them, and asserted the superiority of revelation as the only authoritative guide of faith or practice. There is no sect in the Christian Church which bows with a more willing deference to the mandates of revelation when they have been once ascertained. We are anxious, indeed, not to substitute superstition for intelligent faith, and we can not surrender our right of judging what is the Word of God to every enthusiast or fanatic who may come to us in his own name, or in the name of any Assembly, ancient or modern, and claim submission to his edicts. That which we hold to be revelation, we regard as of supreme authority. Reason may interpret and apply, but it may not set aside the Divine will. It must be a pupil and a servant in the household of faith.

We are charged, again, with depreciating the Scriptures, and with perverting or adulterating them to suit our purposes. To suit our purposes! Yes, that is the language which is used, as if we had some wicked scheme

at heart, which we were bent upon carrying through at any cost of conscience or honour. But, we ask, who pay more true respect to the Scriptures than we? For to them we go that we may learn what is "the Gospel of the blessed God;" and as we refuse to receive any other representation of this Gospel than what we find there, it is plain that, in proportion to the value we set upon the Gospel, must be the regard we bestow on the Scriptures. We claim, indeed, the right of examining and interpreting the Bible for ourselves—a right which we accord to others of every name, and we resist, by fair argument as well as by passive unbelief, the attempt to impose on us as a part of Scripture that which was never written by the sacred authors. We distinguish, too, in regard to the relative importance of different parts of the Bible. We value the Old Testament as the record of a previous dispensation of Divine commandment, and as it contains the history of a special part of the Divine Providence; but we do not go to the Old Testament for the Gospel of Christ. We read with a reverence altogether peculiar whatever was written by the Apostles of Jesus, but we hold in still higher estimation what was said by our Lord himself. The Bible is to us a *sacred* book. We have seen so much mischief resulting from a vague use of language on this subject, that we may have been too careful to define our views of the precise character of the Scriptural documents. But we have wished that all emotion should have a basis of truth; and knowing how dear the Scriptures were to us, we may not have felt so much as we might the importance of treating them in a manner which others could not misconstrue. Once then for all let us say, that we value the Bible above all price, that we honour it as preserving an authentic record of Divine communications, and especially of the life and teaching of Jesus Christ, the greatest of all God's messengers, and that we would rather see every other book destroyed, and science, literature, and art reduced to their primitive condition, than the Bible taken from our daily use, or the use of those who, with us, must go to its pages for "the words of eternal life."

It is said of us, that we do not honour Christ. And the whole ground of this imputation is, that we do not

believe him to be God. For we receive his instructions as Divine, his commandments as authoritative. We listen to his words and we study his life, that we may be made wise in the things which pertain to the kingdom of heaven. We regard his character as our model, and his cross as the anchor of our hope. We believe in him as Saviour, Lord, and Mediator. All this is included in what we have already said. How unjust, then, the charge, that we do not honour Christ! If faith, gratitude, love, reverence, and obedience, enter into the honour which should be paid him, then do we honour him, as we honour no other except God, whom he declared to be greater than himself. In the Scriptural sense, we honour him "as we honour the Father," that is, with as true a reverence and as religious a sentiment; for in him we see the representative of the Father's glory. But we cannot place him on an equality with the Father, for then we should confound the plainest distinctions and impeach the truth which he delivered. God, first and alone in our regard; but next Christ, also alone in those relations to us which he shares with no one else.

It is said, that we do not speak with sufficient force of the evil of sin. Yet we declare that the immediate object of the Gospel was to break down the dominion of sin. We regard the mission of Christ as the most decisive rebuke of sin that could be given, and his life as a testimony against it only less emphatic than his death. We consider reconciliation to God, through the renunciation of evil courses and the culture of inward purity, to be the great achievement of Christianity in the case of every one who comes under its power. We believe that it was sin which made the Gospel necessary, that the mercy which it wrought was what man most wanted, and the regeneration which it effects was what he himself felt the need of, even if he made no attempt to secure a better experience. We are accused of not believing in regeneration. And yet in our view this was one of the chief purposes of the ministry to which Christ was appointed. What could we say, what could we believe, that would indicate a more positive sense of the evil of sin?

It is reported concerning us, that we do not preach retribution. We have said in this article only what we

have always maintained, that after death cometh the judgment. Perhaps we have not pressed this theme upon the conscience as cogently and frequently as we ought. Its solemnity has caused us to approach it with an awe that may have checked our speech. But who that ever attended on the services of our churches can have failed to perceive that our faith embraces the revelation of a future judgment? If we have been less forward than others to try here our powers of description, we have felt that here, least of all, was description in place. It is not description, but affirmation that is needed; the conscience and the imagination of the hearer when awakened outrun the words of the preacher. Judgment and retribution belong to a spiritual rather than a material experience; and spiritual things must be spiritually discerned. It has been our aim, therefore, to quicken the conscience, rather than to inform the intellect; to establish the certainty, rather than to portray the methods of retribution.

But we have spent time enough upon the erroneous conceptions of our belief which prevail around us. We should be glad if we could bring others to lay aside their prejudices and see us in our true relation to the Gospel—as its advocates and disciples. We should be still more glad if we could induce them to interpret the Gospel as we interpret it, that it might stand forth to their view in the same simple and majestic proportions in which it appears to us. But what we most desire is, that it may produce in us the fruits of a true discipleship. Sooner or later the Gospel of Christ must vindicate its own purity from the misconceptions with which it has been loaded. We may hasten that time, and be permitted to see its dawn. Or causes which we cannot control may baffle our efforts and disappoint our hopes. But of one thing we will never suffer ourselves to be deprived—our confidence in the Gospel as Divine and sufficient! Divine in its origin and its character; sufficient for all the purposes which it came to accomplish, and all the uses for which it was designed. One disappointment may we never incur—the disappointment, oh, how bitter and how deplorable! of finding, as the consequence of “holding the truth in unrighteousness,” that the Gospel has become to us not “a savour of life unto life,” but “of death unto

death." It is "the glorious Gospel"—glorious in respect to its Author, its messenger, and its contents—and glorious in its effects upon those who receive and obey the truth. But the folly of man may turn even the grace of God into a means of harm, and the very Gospel of salvation into an occasion of ruin. Christianity compels no love, extorts no service. It renews and sanctifies no one against his will. Faith must receive and obedience must use the Gospel, or its possession will but enhance our guilt and may seal our condemnation.

Christianity is God's "unspeakable gift." But it is a gift to be used; to be *used*; not to be laid aside, as the Bible which contains the history of this wonderful display of God's interest in man is often laid where its gilded leaves and rich covers may be seen, but where it remains for days and weeks unopened; not to be made the subject of an empty admiration or a superficial reverence, but to be used for the purposes for which it was given. These were the redemption of the sinner and the improvement of the believer. It was given for spiritual uses, and for spiritual ends should it be used. He whom the Gospel does not bring out of darkness into light, whom it does not set free from the bondage of sin, whom it does not lead on towards the perfection which is seen in Christ Jesus the great Pattern of excellence, has no faith in Christianity according to the Scriptural import of the term. We insist upon character as the necessary result and only test of genuine faith. We care not for what a man says, if he *do* not as he ought; nay, we care little for what he does, if he *be* not right. The profession must be tried by the life; and even behind the life lies the character, which alone can prove in what regard we hold the Gospel. Obedience must be sincere and thorough. If we would show our gratitude, we must evince it by the diligence we use in bringing the commandments of our Master to bear upon our conduct, and in establishing the principles which he exhibited in his character in their authority over ours. Christianity is a religion for use and not for idle praise—a religion for the heart as well as the intellect.

We insist upon character—upon a right state of the whole man. This is the one thing needful; this, and

nothing besides, neither more nor less. For this was the Gospel given, for this did Jesus our Master bear humiliation and death, that we might put on the righteousness which is through faith. On faith, too, do we insist; but on faith as the means, character as the end. Character! the very word points out the depth and magnitude of the requisition which in our view Christianity makes upon us. It is not a superficial nor a partial effect which is seen in him who is worthy to be called after its name. The complete sanctification of the individual, the establishment of the Divine will over his whole being, in all its motives, exercises, and manifestations, is the work which Christianity contemplates, and which Christianity alone can effect.

CONGREGATIONAL MEMOIRS.

No. II.—LARNE AND KILWAUGHTER.—(*Continued from p. 337.*)

III.—WILLIAM OGILVIE, third minister of Larne and Kilwaughter, 1699—1712.

A great granddaughter of this minister, the late Mrs. Major Rowan, of Merville, near Belfast, kindly favoured me, some years ago, in reply to an application which I made to her on the subject, with the following brief account of her ancestor, and of his connexion with this Congregation:—

“The Rev. William Ogilvie was descended from a younger son of Lord Airlic, and, in the year 1699, got a call from Scotland to take charge of the Presbyterian Congregation of Larne. He was considered a very learned and pious man, and left behind him a great many valuable books and manuscripts, none of which, I grieve to say, are now forthcoming. About the year 17—, the Rev. Mr. Ogilvie married Jane, daughter of Patrick Agnew, Esq., of Kilwaughter House, who assigned, as his daughter's marriage portion, the townland of Ballyloran, held by him under the Antrim family by virtue of a determinable lease. The Rev. W. Ogilvie went to reside at Ballyloran, and there he died, in the year 1712.”

Not exactly in accordance with part of the foregoing is the following statement, with which also I was favoured, some years ago, by a successor, but not a descendant, of Mr. Ogilvie,—the late Dr. Ledlie:—

“About the third minister, Mr. Ogilvie, I could never ascer-

tain anything, except that he married into the Kilwaughter family, and, through the influence of that connexion, his descendants kept possession of Ballyloran, which was originally the Manse of the Congregation.”

In each of these two statements respecting Mr. Ogilvie and Ballyloran, I apprehend that there is a modicum of truth, and also a modicum of incorrectness. But I will throw into the form of a note all that I have been able to ascertain, or led to surmise, concerning the connexion of Mr. Ogilvie and his descendants with this townland, a part of which was, undoubtedly, at one time, and to some extent, congregational property.*

* Mrs. Rowan's statement, as given in the text, would seem to imply that her ancestor's connexion with Ballyloran dated from his marriage with Jane Agnew, of Kilwaughter, and that it was not until after that event that he “went to reside at Ballyloran.” This, however, is incorrect. From the congregational records of the period, an authentic transcript of which is still extant in my possession, and from which quotations will be given in the subsequent part of this memoir, it appears, that certainly at the date of Mr. Ogilvie's settlement in Larne, and probably even in the latter years of Mr. Hall's ministry, the Congregation had an interest in the house and farm of Ballyloran; for we find them making provision, out of their congregational resources, for the repairing, by themselves, of the one, and the cultivation, by themselves, of the other. Now, it is not very likely that Mr. Ogilvie married Jane Agnew before his ordination. Such matrimonial precipitancy belongs to a later period. Nor, even if he had done so, will the reader of the remainder of this paper think it probable that the Congregation of Larne taxed themselves for the repairs of a house and the labouring of a farm, which their minister enjoyed solely as “the marriage portion” of his wife. This was not their way. Nor, again, can I believe that Mr. Agnew, of Kilwaughter, would have taken part, as an elder of the Congregation (which, it appears from a subsequent portion of this narrative, that he did), in raising money from his fellow-worshippers for the repair and cultivation of a dowry house and farm, which his son-in-law had got from himself as a “marriage portion” with his own daughter. I think, then, we must admit, in opposition to the traditionary statement of the Ogilvie family, as given by Mrs. Major Rowan, that the connexion of the Rev. W. Ogilvie with Ballyloran dated from a congregational and not from a matrimonial engagement. But, on the other hand, we are not rashly to accuse my reverend predecessor of spoliation, or allege that, without due cause and notice, he included in his “appropriation” clause the residence and farm, which came to him as minister of Larne and Kilwaughter, and which had been dedicated to the service of his successors. It is not by any means clear, that the congregational *farm* of Ballyloran comprehended the whole of the *townland* of that name, consisting of 160 acres. Undoubtedly, however, the entire townland was, until a very recent period, the property of the Ogilvie family. I therefore propound the following conjecture as a solution of the difficulty:—I apprehend that Mr. Ogilvie, on his settlement in Larne, located himself, as a matter of course, in the

With the settlement of Mr. Ogilvie, in 1699, begins a transcript of the earliest congregational document, so far as I am aware, which is now available towards the his-

congregational house and farm of Ballyloran, which, as being more or less congregational property, were repaired and laboured for him, from the beginning of his ministry, by the congregation. I will suppose that, during the course of his ministry, the lease by which the farm was held from the Antrim family expired—that the minister asked his people to renew the lease—that the people, as people under similar circumstances had probably done before, have certainly done since, and will perhaps do again, refused to incur the expense of a renewal, more especially as they had lately disbursed a considerable sum for the repair of the house—that the minister (perhaps at the suggestion of his father-in-law, Mr. Agnew) told them that if they did not come forward to renew the lease, he would do so in his own name—that he was allowed to fulfil his threat (everybody's business being nobody's business, and nobody but the minister feeling a personal interest in the matter), and (land being then of very little value) that he was further induced, (probably, also, by his father-in-law, Mr. Agnew,) to include in the new lease of Ballyloran, which he took out in his own name, the whole of the townland of that name,—tradition stating that for this purpose he purchased from a family called O'Fey, who afterwards removed to Fey's Town, near Glenarm, their interest in the residue of the townland. The influence of Mr. Ogilvie's father-in-law with the Antrim family would easily secure the accomplishment of this arrangement. But the blame of the transaction I am inclined to divide equally between the niggardliness of the people and the want of scrupulosity on the part of my predecessor. Strange to say, however, even after the completion of this arrangement, and the consequently apparent alienation of the congregational property, the Congregation seem to have retained a claim, permissive or otherwise, upon a part of the townland of Ballyloran; for, within the memory of persons still living, a portion of that townland (not, however, the site of Ballyloran house) was called "Clugston's Land," which would seem to imply that it was for a time the residence (for there is a house upon it) of Mr. Clugstone, who was a successor, but not the immediate successor, of Mr. Ogilvie. The Ogilvie lease of Ballyloran, however it may have been originally obtained, was frequently renewed with the Antrim family, by the successive representatives of the third minister of Larne. On the fall of the last lease, a few years ago, the townland relapsed to the Antrim estate, and, together with other portions of that property, was lately sold to Sir Edward Coey, of Belfast, a native of Larne, who, by a strange coincidence, now owns both Merville and Ballyloran—the former having been the residence, and the latter the inheritance, of the great granddaughter of my predecessor, Rev. W. Ogilvie. For my part, so far as the parish farm is concerned, I grudge not the worthy knight the "bonnie rigs" of Ballyloran. If, indeed, matters had taken their proper course 160 years ago, I might now have been in the profitable occupation of these fertile fields. But the present owner's title to them is indefeasible. "He won them well; may he enjoy them long." I may add, that, within the last few years, this townland has resumed, to some extent, its ancient sacred character, having been very judiciously chosen as the site of the mause which has been lately erected for the minister of the Presbyterian Congregation of "Larne and Inver."

tory of the Congregation of Larne and Kilwaughter. The original of this most interesting, and, perhaps, in the present day, almost unique congregational record, I have not, after a diligent search of many years, been able to discover.* But, fortunately, a copy of it was made or procured some years ago, by (I believe) the late Rev. Samuel Eccles, of Armagh, a native of Larne, for his friend, the late Rev. D. Davison, of London, who published some extracts from it in the *Christian Moderator* of 1826, pp. 207—245; a periodical which was then appearing in the metropolis under the editorship of my brother, Mr. Scott Porter. This transcript found its way into my hands shortly after my ordination in Larne, and from it I shall now, with the reader's permission, proceed to make rather copious quotations, arranged, not chronologically, but according to subject and under separate heads, for which arrangement I am responsible. These extracts embrace a period of only three years, 1699 to 1701, being the first years of Mr. Ogilvie's ministry. They will, I fear, be somewhat lengthened; but I hope the Editor and readers of this periodical will forgive their length, if not for the occasional drollness of the incidents which they record, and quaintness of the expressions which they exhibit, at least for the valuable and rare insight which they give us into the internal economy and discipline of a Presbyterian Congregation in Ulster at the beginning of the last century. I commence with

1. THE SINGULAR WOOING AND WINNING OF MR. OGILVIE BY THE WIDOWED CONGREGATION OF LARNE AND KILWAUGHTER.

“FEB. 1699 (1700).—Mr. Campbell (John Campbell, minister of Cairncastle, who had been ordained there in 1689) writes a letter to John Boyd (Session Clerk and Parish Schoolmaster of Larne), desiring that we may be diligent to use means for the encouraging Mr. Ogilvie (to settle amongst us), lest we should be supplanted (or forestalled by another congregation), and forthwith to buy a horse to him before next meeting (of Presbytery); whereupon James Callwell and Samuel Smeally resolves to goe to Glenarm, or at least one of them, with Robert M'Sinch, who is supposed to have skill of horse (some gifts *are* hereditary) to look for one; for so Mr. Campbell advised, for he said he would be

* I now fancy that I know where it is; and I am also happy to think that it is in very safe keeping.

there himself on Monday next. Notice sent to Mr. Agnew anent this.

"FEB. 25.—Reported Mr. Agnew and Kilwochter Elders consent to the buying of the horse at Glenarm for Mr. Ogilvie. It is appointed that Daniel Eccles and John Callwell, and with them Robert M'Ninch, to go to Glenarm to-morrow to look for one. Robert Nelson (also a good name to this day for 'skill of horse') says he will go to Islandmagee, and speak to Thomas Silliman, who has a good horse, if one be not got in Glenarm.

"FEB. 27.—Reported the horse is bought at Glenarm for Mr. Ogilvie, and he has received him, and he is gone to Larne this day. The price is . . . (*hiatus valde defendus*).

"APRIL 21.—The young people will pay the horse price."

"Was ever minister in this humour woo'd?
Was ever minister in this humour won?"

The Congregation literally caught Mr. Ogilvie with a horse.

2. THE PROPOSAL AND THE SETTLEMENTS.

"FEB. 25, 1699 (1700).—Andrew Snoddy appointed to attend next Presbytery at Ballymenoch, on Tuesday, 5th March next, with a supplication prosecuting our call, and for our supply by Mr. Ogilvie till next ensuing Presbytery."

"MARCH 3.—Appointed James Callwell, Samuel Smeally, Wm. Hare, and John Glasgow, sen., to goe to next Presbytery, to prefer our supplication for the expediting of Mr. Ogilvie's trials, and supply by him till next ensuing Presbytery. The extract of the Presbytery's Minute concerning us is as follows:—'AT BALLYMENOCHE, MARCH 3, 1699.—From the Parish of Lairn appeared Samuel Smealley, William Hare, John Glasgow, and James Callwell, supplicating this Presbytery that Mr. William Ogilvie may be put forward in his trials, and that the Presbytery deal with them to embrace their call, and that he may supply them with preaching till next meeting. This meeting did deal with Mr. Ogilvie to embrace the call of Lairn, and the answer he gave was, that for anything which at present he knew, he would embrace their call!! (Oh, the naughty man, had he not taken their horse?) and submit himself therein to the appointment of this Presbytery. And this meeting (*i.e.*, the Presbytery) promiseth to further his trials, and appoints him to supply that Congregation with his conveniency until the next May meeting. The Presbytery orders the Parish of Lairn to make the quota of stipend for Mr. Ogilvie £38 (a considerable sum in those days—much more than £38 now), with 400 loads of turf, plowing, harrowing, &c., &c., and that they bring in their quarter's stipend against the next May meeting (to pay supplies during vacancy).—John Lee, *Clk. Pby. Ant.*'

"MAY 12, 1699 (1700).—The Commissioners, James Callwell and Daniel Eccles reports from the Presbytery that Mr. Ogilvie is to supply us for two Sabbaths together, of which this is the first; and that Mr. Campbell (of Cairncastle), with his first conveniency, is to

come here on a week-day and lecture, and see the Parish bonds for the quota of stipend to Mr. William Ogilvie, and about fireing, plowing, harrowing, and shearing."

Surely these entries prove that before Mr. Ogilvie's ordination, and consequently before his marriage to Jane Agnew, there was a parish farm; and subsequent entries will shew that that parish farm was Ballyloran.

"This day the Commissioners also report they delivered the quarter's stipend to the Presbytery, and that the Presbytery has remitted thirty shillings of the said money, and has accepted of £6, in consideration that the Parish has much to do for the present (they were about to re-build their meeting-house), and Mr. Pettigrew (Ballymena), in name of the Presbytery, has given a discharge for the £6.

"MAY 17.—By appointment of last Presbytery at Ballymenoch, the 7th of this inst., Mr. John Campbell came here and lectured, and after sermon asked if the bonds for Mr. W. Ogilvie's stipend be paid, which he was appointed to call for. Mr. Patrick Agnew and the rest of the heads of the families answered that they were almost ready to the filling up of the blanks. He (Mr. Campbell) demanded what quota of stipend would they bind for? It is answered, for £36 per annum, with fireing, plowing, harrowing, and shearing in harvest. To which Mr. Campbell replies that the Presbytery expects that the quota shall be £38, with the other duties. Mr. Campbell says that in regard it was something referred to him anent the forty shillings, he overtured that, for the first two or three years, it is probable the forty shillings would not be required, but afterwards it would be demanded. They would not acquiesce to that either, but stands still to bind only for the £36, with the other duties. Mr. Campbell says he can do no more in it, but will report the particulars to the Presbytery, and shall not be against us, but what he says will be rather for us. He asketh for the bondsmen (*i.e.*, bailsmen to secure the payment to the minister of the stipend promised); is answered—Mr. Patrick Agnew and John Glasgow, sen., for Kilwochter, binds for £8 sterling, with proportion of fireing, plowing, and harrowing; James Callwell and Robert Glasgow for South Side, for £10, with proportion of turf, plowing, &c., &c.; James Kerr, of Corran, and John Callwell, of Ballycraigy, for the North Side of the landward of Lairn, for £6; with proportion of turf, &c., &c.; Charles Adam and Hugh Smith for the Oldtown, for £4, with proportion of turf, shearing, and work at hay; those who have horses to help to harrow; William Hare, William Murray, Robert Kerr, and Robert Mea, jun., for Newtown, for £8, with proportion of turf, shearing, winnowing of hay, &c., &c. Mr. Campbell says he is satisfied with the bondsmen. The parish promiseth to make the ten acres of sown land good for this year. Mr. Campbell says there must be 400 loads of turf promised yearly, of which Oldtown and Newtown are to pay 100 loads yearly, viz., 40 loads for the Oldtown and 60 for the Newtown. The town of Glen is to join with Oldtown and

Newtown in shearing and work at hay; and who has horse to help to harrow.

"MAY 19.—It is thought fit that the masters of families be present at the signing of the bonds to save the bondsmen harmless.

"MAY 26.—John Kerr, sen., James Kerr, William Murray, and Robert Glasgow appointed to produce the bonds (to the Presbytery), and to supplicate for expediting Mr. Ogilvie's ordination.

"JUNE.—Our Commissioners report they produced the bonds for the stipend, but the Presbytery refused to accept of them, because they commenced not at the Hallowday last; and therefore John Boyd, the Clerk (of Session), is appointed to draw them to begin at Hallowday last.

"JUNE.—Appointed James Ramsay and Robert White to attend next Presbytery in Ballymenoch, on Tuesday, the 2nd July next, to forward Mr. Ogilvie's ordination, and to assure the Presbytery our bonds shall be ready. John Boyd, the Clerk, shall have our bonds ready against Friday. It is done.

"JULY.—Our Commissioners report from the Presbytery that our bonds for the stipend were received and accepted for the payment of £36 per annum, with plowing, turf, shearing, winning of hay, &c., &c. They also report that Mr. Ogilvie is to preach his popular sermon next Presbytery at Ballymenoch, on 2nd Wednesday of August next; he is to supply us till then; but he is to be absent next the 7th of this instant at Cairncastle Communion.

"AUGUST.—Commissioners appointed to attend next Presbytery at Ballymenoch, on the 14th inst, (Robert Nelson, Patrick Crawford, and Alexander Millar) to supplicate and plead to have the ordination day the first Tuesday of September, because, if it be delayed longer, the harvest will be on; and another argument is, there not being another minister nearer than six miles (Ballycarry?), which is far to go with children to baptism, Mr. Campbell being now in Scotland.

"(OCTOBER?).—Our Commissioners, viz., James Callwell and Samuel Smeally, report that the Presbytery has appointed its next meeting to be held at Larne the 5th November next; and the ordination on Wednesday thereafter,—Mr. Ogilvie to supply us till then. They also report there must be accommodation made for ten ministers and twenty horses [this, I think, included provision for the elders' horses; but why were the elders themselves overlooked?] at the parish charge! Appointed the elders in Kilwochter shall speak to Mr. Campbell for advyce whether it (*i.e.*, the ordination dinner) shall be in a publick house, and the company to pay, or the parish to provide provisions and a house."

I am sorry to say that the record from which I quote gives no account of Mr. Ogilvie's ordination, nor of the subsequent dinner. In the case of the ordination, the omission was not the fault of the Clerk of Larne Session; for under date April 27, 1701, he records that "Robert Murdoch (an Elder from Larne) had attended the Presbytery at Glenarm, but could not get Mr. Lee

(Clerk of the Presbytery) at leisure to give an extract of the ordination." This document was often applied for, and, if it had been procured from the Clerk of the Presbytery, would doubtless now have appeared on the Session Book of Larne and Kilwaughter. A writer in the *Christian Moderator* (Vol. i. p. 429) states that "Mr. Ogilvie of Larne was examined before ordination in Hebrew, Greek Testament, Chronology, Cases of Conscience, and reconciling Scriptures, in addition to former trials."

3. RE-BUILDING OF THE MEETING-HOUSE.*

"MARCH, 1699.—Appointed next Thursday a word of Lecture by Mr. Ogilvie (who was constant supplier), and the heads of families to meet, of which there was advertisement given this day.

"APRIL, 1699.—Mr. Ogilvie preached, and, after sermon, the heads of families met towards the re-building of the Meeting house. It was referred to the consideration of Mr. Patrick Agnew, Charles Adam, James Kerr, John Glasgow, sen., and James Callwell, after what form of wideness and height of wall it should be, and, accordingly, timber to be provided. And to look for the timber, Charles Adam and Robert Nealsone were appointed, and money to be given to bear their charges, and to *earn* the timber (*i.e.*, give "earnest" money on account of it), and forthwith lime to be provided. Appointed notice shall be given to Captain Johnstone (of Glynn), if he come here before Saturday, to meet with Mr. Agnew to consider about the Meeting-house. William White promiseth to get him notice if he can.

"APRIL 21, 1699.—James Callwell reporteth he gave notice to Captain Johnstone, who adviseth to see if Captain Shaw, of Bush, has a lease of the ground that the Meeting-house stands on.†

* The first Meeting-house in Larne was built, I should think, about 1668, being the year when the Presbyterian Congregations in Ulster, which were then established, were in general furnished with houses of worship, after having been ejected from the parish churches in 1661.

† John Shaw, who died some years ago in a lunatic asylum in Dublin, was a life in what was called "the Mill-Lease," which included the "Mill-Brae" adjoining the Meeting-house, and probably, also, the ground on which the Meeting-house stands. Can he have been a descendant of "Captain Shaw, of Bush?" His father, George Shaw, had been, in early life, a sergeant in Ligonier's Black-Horse. Latterly he was weighmaster in Larne, and, on account of his loyalty and bravery on the 7th June, 1798, received a small pension from Government, which he enjoyed till his death. Our Meeting-house ground was, I think, originally connected in some way with the "Mill Tenement." The field immediately above the Meeting-house was called "The Shilling-hill," on account of the people going there to clean their corn; and a respectable old man told me, many years ago, that he remembered the time when the Meeting-house green,

To this Mr. Agnew answereth that what . . . (is reasonable?) may be expected. However, to go on with all possible forwarding of the dimensions of the house, and to provide money for the work. And, for that end, men are to go through the quarters, to see first what each person offers, and if that will not do, then some other way must be taken. And, for going, an elder and another man with him, are appointed. Or this overture is made, that on a lecture day the people be advertised to come prepared with what they will give towards this work.

"APRIL 28, 1699.—William White reporteth that Mr. Campbell's advice is, that Mr. Ogilvie, after sermons, give advertisement to the heads of families to stay, and the Clerk to tell for what end, the which was done, viz., that forthwith money must be raised for building the meeting-house and other necessary uses.

"MAY 5, 1699.—Appointed that this week incoming an Elder and another man with him shall go through their quarters, to see what every one offers towards this work, and how that will rise.

"MAY 19, 1699.—It is thought fit that the meeting-house shall be taken down to the foundation. For further preparation for the re-building thereof, the people get public advertisement to come on Thursday next for that week.

"(JUNE ?) 1699.—The meeting-house is now taken down; the old wall taken out two feet on every side; the side-wall to be fourteen feet high; the cupples to be set on the wall head.

"(SEPT. OR OCT. ?) 1699.—Appointed when Mr. Agnew comes home, that the people come for dividing the house and getting up of seats, and how the charges of glassing the windows will be defrayed. Intimation was made to the people of this Congregation to come prepared with money, the next Lord's Day we have sermon here, towards the paying of the charges of glassing the windows of the meeting-house; and two at each door to collect."

The meeting-house built at this time was thatched, for in 1701 it was ready for a new coat of straw.

"APRIL 13, 1701.—It is appointed that a word be spoken anent the thatching of the meeting-house.

The meeting-house was again taken down, and re-built in 1753, as appears from the Session Book of that year. The present meeting-house was built in 1829.

being unenclosed, was used for the same purpose. It was Squire Agnew who induced the Congregation to enclose the green with a ditch, and plant some trees round their house of worship. The present Meeting-house ground is more than double the size that it was originally, is enclosed with a substantial wall and gates, and surrounded by venerable trees, which are an ornament to the neighbourhood.

“EMMANUEL, GOD WITH US.”

WE have here the announcement of an all-important fact, in phrase the most sublime, the most consolatory. Jesus is our Emmanuel; and the conviction steals over the heart “like the sweet south,” soothing and yet invigorating. In words brief and simple, and yet with the grandeur appertaining to Scripture and to no other writings, we are told of the relation of the Saviour to us,—how the word was made flesh, and dwelt among us full of grace and truth,—that the Christ was God’s representative—acted for him, mediated between him and ourselves. The Lord Jesus is clothed with divine authority—is clad in robes of light as the brightness of the Father’s glory. God is thus pleased to manifest himself, not immediately, but mediately, and this in accordance with all his proceedings, whether of nature or grace. He is never personally visible; he is not, perhaps cannot be, the object of our senses; his presence pervades all space; but in himself he remains “the Great Invisible;” and to poor, frail, trembling mortals it must ever be a subject of devout acknowledgment that there was—is—one born of woman—made in all respects like his brethren—fully informed of the Father’s mind and will, and made the author of eternal salvation to all who should obey him. Jesus is “God with us,” because he stands to us in the place of God. He reveals the divine purposes; he proclaims pardon and peace from on high. He, the first-born among many brethren, manifests the free, unpurchased love of the common Father to the whole human race.

And the paternal attributes of God were shewn forth in Jesus in his every action and word. The Father is tender and forgiving—does not willingly punish, nor does he exact more from his children than they are able to render. He knows how to give good gifts to his offspring, and he apportions these gifts to their capacities, their opportunities, and their wants. In all this Jesus stands to us in place of the Father. It is no figure of speech that in him dwelleth all the fulness of the godhead bodily. The incarnation of Christ is a glorious fact. God was in him reconciling the world to himself. As we see him

depicted in the Gospel,—as we contemplate the surpassing excellencies of his character,—as we follow him through Judea and Galilee, and listen to his words, and witness his miracles, and have fellowship in his sufferings, and thus know the power of his resurrection,—we perceive how the Father dwelt in him—how, in seeing him, we see the Father.

The character of Christ is entirely that of God. He and the Father are one. There is the most complete unity in their purposes. God is love and Christ is love. God is holy and pure, and Christ was ever holy, harmless, undefiled. The pure in heart shall see God, and, seeing Christ, they behold the perfection of moral excellence. God is not only theoretically but practically benevolent; he does good continually; and so the Lord Jesus went about doing good—now at Jerusalem—now at Nain—now in the towns of Galilee—and, again, at Bethany. His were acts of the purest love—of the tenderest compassion. “I will, be thou clean.” “Jesus loved Martha, and her sister, and Lazarus.” He wept at the tomb of his friend. He, in the last hour of mortal agony, the words distilling, as it were, from his lips, drop by drop, commends his mother to the care of the beloved disciple. “Woman, behold thy Son,” “Behold thy mother.” Thus, in the most lovely of the divine attributes does Jesus stand to us as the Emmanuel. God draws nigh to us as a father, and in the Son’s name we come to him; through Jesus we present our prayers, and through him we have an answer of peace.

Again, the Lord Christ is God with us, inasmuch as he saves his people from their sins. It ought never to be forgotten, that God, even the Father, is our Saviour in the first and the highest sense,—so, in the same way, is God our redeemer and our sanctifier. He, however, to magnify his power and grace, delegates these offices to the beloved Son, and hence it is that Jesus is said to save us from our sins, and to this end the name of Saviour is given to him. Jesus acts in the name of, and in the place of, God; he makes known the Father’s salvation, the terms, also, on which this salvation is to be secured. Still, Jesus saves us *from* our sins; he does not save us *in* our sins, nor does God, the Father, promise forgiveness,

and salvation, and life, on any terms short of repentance and amendment. Jesus saves us from sin, its condemning and destroying power—saves us from ourselves, our vain desires, our unsanctified thoughts, our furious downward passions—from worldliness and the bondage of corruption,—and thus he is with us in God's place, and in this way, by taking flesh upon him, being of our nature, subjected to all the trials and innocent infirmities of humanity, he becomes effectually our Saviour. God can neither suffer nor die, the very idea is shocking. But we know what human suffering is—we know what must have been the agonised feeling prompting the words, "Now is my soul troubled, and what shall I say?" And most deeply can we sympathize with him who uttered them. His sorrow becomes our sorrow, and so true to our inmost hearts is that Scripture, "By his stripes we are healed"—we feel those stripes as if laid on our own loins, as we feel the nails driven into the hands, the spear thrust into his side,—and we feel, also, that it is thus Jesus saves, that thus his cross is the hope of glory. So is he with us, redeeming and sanctifying. Through God he is the mighty deliverer from sin and from the bondage of eternal death.

Jesus is the Emmanuel, in the doctrines and precepts he delivers. The doctrines not discoverable by reason are yet found in exact conformity with reason—with reason in its purest form. Now the doctrine of Christ is according to godliness. He teaches us, as we have seen, that God is our Father, hence we deduce our common origin and brotherhood; and nothing has a greater tendency to annihilate pride and selfishness than a recognition of the truth that all men are brethren—to them a common salvation is offered, and Jesus is the messenger alike to all. Thus he represents the Father. So the precepts delivered by our Lord have a heavenly origin; they are summed up in love to God and man. Love to God includes all the devout affections, spirituality of life, submission to the divine will, and the rejection of all unhallowed thoughts. Love to man includes justice of the brightest kind, abstaining from everything injurious to our neighbour, speaking truth to him, letting our light shine before him. Love is not negative—it is actively

benevolent. Love is of God, and he that is born of God loves all around him. The love of God created man—supports man—redeems and sanctifies man,—and the love of the Lord Jesus was manifested towards us. He was rich, and for our sakes he became poor; he gave up the world for our benefit; he lived and he acted for our benefit. The Father evinced his love towards us, by giving his Son, not sparing him, for our salvation; and the Son freely carried out the Father's purpose, so that they were one in whatever had relation to our final happiness. Thus was God present to his creatures, and thus did Jesus glorify him by finishing the work given him to do.

The Emmanuel likewise spake with all the Father's authority, with the full consciousness of his divine commission. The Sovereign is always supposed to be present in the person charged with the royal commission; an insult offered to such a person is justly considered as offered to the Sovereign himself. Jesus gave the most unquestionable proofs of his coming from God, of his being the anointed of the most High. He spake as never man spake; he not only spake but he acted, and challenged his works as the indubitable evidences of his claims; and when Jesus walked on the sea, calmed the tempest, restored the arm that had been withered, cleansed the leper, gave sight to the blind, "called the sleeping dead to life,"—he truly was as God walking the earth, and subjecting all nature to his sway. He was, then, the Emmanuel, and men acknowledged that in him God was present with them. Of himself, as he acknowledged with devout humility, he could do nothing, but the Father had committed all things into his hands. Thus we find in him whatever is necessary for our salvation, and we gratefully record, that he is made to us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption; and so would we join the song of the redeemed—"Worthy is the Lamb that was slain, to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honour, and blessing."
 "Blessing, and honour, and glory, and power, be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb for ever and ever."

T. B.

GROUNDS FOR APPREHENSIONS.

IN the judgment recently given by the Master of the Rolls in the Ballyclare case, his Honor alleges that he had no satisfactory evidence laid before him to show that there was any foundation for the recital in the Rev. Mr. M'Alester's motion, namely—"That recent events in connection with this Presbytery have caused serious apprehensions in the minds of some members that candidates for license, ordination, or installation may be accepted, although they should not believe in the Holy Scriptures as containing a Divine Revelation, or in the Divine Mission and authority of Jesus Christ, as the Son of God and the Saviour of men." It may be perfectly correct that no evidence in this matter was laid before his Honor, or none at least that appeared to him satisfactory; but in the debate that arose in the Presbytery meeting of January 1, 1862, at which the motion was brought forward, reasons were given by me that, to my own mind, seemed amply sufficient to justify the apprehensions entertained by myself and others, and to lead us to demand for our own sakes, as well as for the vindication of the Christian character of the Presbytery, the adoption of some such resolution as that which I brought forward. I think it right briefly to state the reasons then adduced, in order to show that the motion, the rejection of which led to the disruption of the Presbytery, was not wantonly introduced, and that the apprehensions entertained had a reasonable foundation.

The Rev. S. C. Nelson, in his discourse preached before the Non-Subscribing Association, in February, 1859, took an opportunity towards the close of it, to refer to Theodore Parker, of Boston, U.S., whose death had recently taken place; he dwelt with much severity on the Unitarian ministers of Boston for not recognizing him as one of their communion, and represented them as persecutors of a Christian brother. He expressed the hope that no such narrowness would characterize our body, and cautioned us against cherishing such a spirit. Now, I knew that Theodore Parker, with much that the best of us might profitably imitate, entirely denied a divine revelation, denounced the Scriptures, and rejected

the Mastership of Christ; and I felt that Mr. Nelson, in his remarks, made himself, to some degree, an apologist for these objectionable, and, as I believe, unchristian principles. I do not pretend to quote Mr. Nelson's language, but merely to give the impression made on my own mind and on the mind of others. Nor should I omit to say, that Mr. Nelson afterwards alleged that he had put in a qualifying phrase, which greatly modified his meaning: but there was enough to satisfy me then, as well as on an earlier occasion, when he took the Presidential chair, that however evangelical his own opinions may be, he was strongly disposed to fraternize with the school of Parkerism.

Again, when the York Street Congregation applied to be admitted into the Presbytery of Antrim, their ground of application was, that they would not allow their minister to be examined respecting his belief in Christianity by any party but themselves. This extreme liberty the Remonstrant Synod could not grant them, and therefore they applied to the Presbytery of Antrim; and a majority of that body passed a resolution to receive them on their own terms, that is, with the distinct understanding that the Presbytery would ask the minister whom they might choose, no questions; and thus, from the opinions which, it was well known, prevailed for a length of time among certain leaders of the York Street Congregation, it was reasonable to suppose that some one holding Parkerite views might be elected, and the Presbytery had, by their own admission, no power to refuse him ordination. That the Rev. J. Jellie was the person chosen in no way disproves the view which I have expressed. As a leading member of the Congregation afterwards said, "He was not the kind of person they would have liked, but he suited their purpose"!

Farther, in the English Unitarian Church, between which and the Non-Subscribing Churches in this country a strong sympathy has existed for many years, the divine authority of Revelation and the divine mission of Christ had recently been regarded as "open questions;" and, under the name of Unitarianism, opinions utterly subversive of divine revelation had been openly preached in some English pulpits: while one, whose vigour of mind

and popularity as a minister have gained for him considerable weight, deliberately stated, in an article in the *Westminster Review*, that "in England and America Mr. Parker's interpretation of Christianity bids fair to become the dominant thought of the Unitarian Church."

These circumstances, and others, in themselves perhaps unimportant, but taken together sufficient to produce an effect, awakened in my mind the serious apprehensions which, in the recital of my motion, I expressed. It may be said that on such evidence a jury of intelligent men would not find a verdict. True; but what is insufficient to produce conviction, may be quite enough to cause reasonable apprehension: and if the majority of the Presbytery believed that those who entertained such apprehensions were needlessly alarmed, it was their duty to do what they could to remove any fears from the minds of the weaker brethren. This they might have done, by declaring that the apprehensions expressed by me were without any real foundation; and that they would not ordain any candidate of whose belief in the divine authority of revelation they were not fully satisfied. Perhaps the outrageous amendment that was brought forward may be traced to undue excitement among the majority: but its object seems to have been to get rid of the motion, without committing themselves before the public to the loose principles which that motion was designed to counteract: and it is certain that not one of the majority has since publicly avowed his belief that to ordain a candidate who did not acknowledge the divine mission of the Saviour would be a violation of his Christian principles. Some may thus think, but they have never, so far as I know, declared such to be their opinion. Others, however, avowedly hold the doctrine that no such belief in the divine mission of Christ is a necessary qualification for the work of the ministry; to this class belong Mr. McCalmont, an Elder of the York Street Congregation, and those whom he included in his ecclesiastical scheme. It might be said that the fact of the Presbytery making the Scriptures the "sole rule of faith," secures the Christianity of the body; but many of them have circulated freely among their people a tract, in which this glorious Christian principle is explained to mean only "a standing

protest against the assumption of infallibility in the interpretation of Scripture by the Romish Church." Less refined Christians are disposed to see in "*the Scriptures our sole rule of faith*" not merely a protest against Popish infallibility, but a grateful acknowledgment of the precious truth which God has in the Scriptures revealed for our instruction, guidance, and salvation.

If, however, the ministers and elders who now constitute the Presbytery of Antrim believe, as is sometimes alleged, that there were no grounds for the alarm entertained by the seceding brethren, and that they never contemplated such a loose interpretation of the principles of the Presbytery as has been imputed to them, let them only frankly say so. Let them pass a resolution, or issue a letter couched in whatever terms may seem to them most appropriate, not binding themselves to any particular view of Christ's nature or any particular scheme of inspiration, but simply declaring that they regard a belief in Christ's divine mission and in the divine authority of revelation as essential qualifications for the ministry in their church, and I can certainly say for myself, and I think I may say also for the others who have seceded, that the ground of our apprehensions will be removed, and that despite of hard words that have been spoken, and hard sentences that have been written against us, we will cheerfully join the Presbytery again, and unite with our former friends in maintaining those liberal Christian principles which have been transmitted to us and our people by the founders of the Presbytery as a precious and sacred trust.

C. J. M'ALESTER.

HOLYWOOD, Dec. 15, 1863.

JOSEPH BARKER RETURNED TO CHRISTIANITY.

MANY of our readers still retain a lively recollection of Joseph Barker, who was at one time a popular preacher in connexion with one of the Methodist bodies, and afterwards embraced Unitarian views of Christian truth. More than eighteen years ago, he visited Belfast for the purpose of advocating his opinions, and delighted large

audiences by his simple eloquence, his powerful reasoning, his great familiarity with the Scriptures, and his wonderful self-possession in the midst of uproar and threatened violence. Some time after, he seems to have abandoned all faith in Christianity as a Divine Revelation, and to have adopted Deistical opinions, and then to have wandered still farther into unbelief, and to have embraced Atheism or something akin to it. He was for some years identified with the Secularist party in England, and was joined, we believe, with Holyoake, in efforts to disseminate their views. More recently still, he edited an independent Secularist journal, entitled "*Barker's Review*." Within the last two or three months a change appears to have passed over his mind, and, after all his wanderings, he seems to have returned to a devout acknowledgment of the Gospel; and, while much confidence cannot be placed in the stability of one who has made so many changes, there is reason to hope that the great abilities which he possesses, and which for years were employed to spread unbelief, may now be devoted to a holier work.

In a late number of his *Review* he thus concludes an able article on the Bible:—"The return of so many who, through evil influences, have been led astray into anti-Christian error, to their first love of the Bible, and their confessions of shame and regret at their folly, furnish further proof of the worth of the Book. It is a fact, that hardly any of those who have once really studied and truly loved the Bible can remain in a state of apostacy and unbelief. Sooner or later, the passion that hurried them into hostility to the Bible and the Church dies away, and they stand ashamed and horrified, and return with grief and tears and deep humiliation, to their Heavenly Guide and Comforter. Several who had been unhappy, carried away from God and Christ and the Bible, have returned of late, bitterly bemoaning their grievous error, and warning the young to beware of the Tempter, and learn betimes to cherish persistently their love of the Sacred Volume, by the sad experience of their elders."

In a still later number, in reply to a correspondent who remonstrates with him on his return to Christianity, he thus writes—"You seem desirous to know whether we are a Christian, *as the world understands it*, or not.

Hoping it may be of some use to you, we give you a very plain answer. We believe we are, with this exception, that Christianity is, both in reality and in our estimation, the perfection of wisdom and goodness; we are the subject of many and grievous imperfections. We accept Christ as our Teacher, our Master, and our Saviour, with a *desire* to learn his lessons, to obey his precepts, and to share his salvation; but we are far from having realised all we desire. We must use the words of another repentant opponent of Christianity—We do not pretend to have fully attained the object on which our hearts are set, but this one thing we do, forgetting those things which are behind and reaching forth unto those things which are before, we press towards the mark, in hopes of gaining the glorious prize by and bye. . . . You, like ourselves, know many things about the tendency of infidelity and the conduct of its leading advocates, and of a large proportion of its disciples, which it would not be pleasant to lay before the public. You must, by this time, have almost satisfied yourself, that, however plausible infidelity may appear, its tendency is to utter ruin both of soul and body. It is with unaffected concern that we think of the sorrows that lie before you, and of the horror that will one day seize on you, if you persist in your present course. Most gladly would we save you from those sorrows and that horror, if we could. But some are not to be taught but by sad experience, and you may be of the unhappy number.”

REVIEW.

THE SUNDAY-SCHOOL PENNY MAGAZINE: *New Series. Published by the Manchester District Sunday-School Association.*

WE perceive that this old-established and favourite magazine has just undergone a change in its management, and is now under the joint editorship of Mr. Dendy, and the Revs. R. H. Gibson, T. E. Poynting, and J. C. Street. Judging from the January number, just issued, and from the well-known interest which the Editors have long manifested in the Sunday-School work, we have reason to expect that it will deserve, still more than in past years, the support of all interested in the moral and religious improvement of the young and in the progress of the Sunday-School work.

INTELLIGENCE.

SCOTTISH UNITARIAN ASSOCIATION.

ON Wednesday evening, November 30, the annual meeting of this Association was held in Aberdeen. On the previous day the Rev. A. Gordon had preached, morning and evening, on behalf of the Association. In the morning he explained, from Rom. xiv. 4, the difference of the principles on which the Unitarians and the other denominations proposed to make men religious and to secure their salvation. In the evening, from 2 Cor. v. 16, he gave an eloquent exposition of the life and character of Christ. Both services were numerously attended.

The public meeting on Monday evening was held in the Music Hall,—Mr. George Hope, of Fentonbarns, occupied the chair. After tea had been served, Mr. Hope introduced the proceedings by an appropriate and impressive address.

The Rev. R. B. Drummond then submitted the annual report, which mentioned the appointment of the Rev. W. Sharman as Missionary, and detailed the operations of the Association during the year. We have only room for the following extract:—

“It is painful to have to report that the congregation at Girvan is without a minister, owing to the loss of the late lamented Mr. Scott. Should it be possible to render any assistance, no pains will be spared to do so. The congregation at Paisley appears prosperous, owing to the indefatigable exertions of Mr. Callender. Mr. Crosskey, as secretary to your association, has rendered occasional aid; and it was also visited by your missionary. In the neighbourhood of Glasgow various lectures have been delivered by the members of an active local committee, who have, however, greatly to deplore the untimely loss of their most zealous member, and most effective preacher, the late Mr. Robert Nicol. Report must also be made of distribution of tracts, and correspondence with scattered friends through the country. On the whole, your committee believe they have good reason to entertain the best hopes for the future of the association.”

The report having been adopted, the election of officers was proceeded with. An application for the assistance of the missionary being received from Dundee, Mr. Sharman was appointed to preach in Dundee upon one Sabbath in each month, and to deliver a lecture upon one evening in each alternate week, and at the end of three months to report the results. An application was also received from Stirling, and votes were made complying with that request, and also authorizing Mr. Crosskey to conduct six additional services in Paisley. It was further resolved to proffer assistance to the Girvan congregation.

The meeting was afterwards addressed by the Revs. R. B. Drummond, W. Sharman, H. Crosskey, and A. Gordon, and by Messrs. Warren and Tawse, of Aberdeen, and Mr. H. Blythe, of Edinburgh. In the intervals between the addresses instrumental and vocal music was supplied by an excellent choir; and the proceedings were brought to a close by Mr. Crosskey pronouncing the benediction.

LARNE AND KILWAUGHTER YOUNG MEN'S CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATION.

On Thursday evening, November 26, the fourth annual meeting and anniversary soiree of this Society was held in the school-room attached to the First Presbyterian Church, Larne. There was a large attendance, composed principally of the members and their friends, to the number of about 250. The ladies of the Congregation had the room beautifully decorated with flowers, evergreens, and appropriate mottoes. Justice having been done to the tea and other good things provided, the Rev. Classon Porter, President of the Association, took the chair. After a few introductory remarks, he said that they were met partly for business and partly for pleasure. The first business to be done was to receive the report of the committee and the treasurer's account for the past year, and he would now call upon their worthy Secretary, Mr. James Craig, to read the report of the committee for the past year. Mr. Craig read the annual report, which detailed the lectures given and the papers read during the year, and was most satisfactory. Mr. David Nelson then read the treasurer's account, which showed a balance in favour of the society of £2 14s.

The President, in the unavoidable absence of the Revs. Moore Getty and James Callwell, moved the adoption of the report and the appointment of the office bearers and committee for the ensuing year. The motion, on being put to the meeting, was carried unanimously. Messrs. James M'Calmont, J. Larmour, R. Hunter, and J. M'Ninch addressed the meeting. During the evening, several pieces of sacred music were sung by the Congregational choir, with accompaniments on the harmonium by Mr. Craig. The proceedings of a very pleasant evening were brought to a close by the President pronouncing the benediction.

STANHOPE STREET NATIONAL SCHOOLS.

The half-yearly examination of the children of the above-named schools, in connexion with the Belfast Domestic Mission, took place in the school-rooms on Wednesday, December 23. The Revs. W. Bruce, J. Scott Porter, and T. Bowring, R. Nesbitt, Esq., District Inspector, V. Whitla, and — Percy, Esqrs., with a considerable number of ladies, were present, and much interest was manifested throughout the proceedings. The examination left a very favourable impression on the minds of the visitors, shewing that considerable progress had been made during the last six months. Many premiums for attention and good conduct (the gifts of Mr. and Miss Whitla) were awarded, and were presented to the successful pupils by the Rev. J. Scott Porter, accompanied to each child by a pleasant and affectionate word—a word which will, doubtless, be in many a memory for long after years. Some pretty pieces were pleasingly sung by the children, "God save the Queen" and "God bless the Prince of Wales" being heartily chorussed.

OBITUARY.

Died, at his residence, Ballymacash, near Lisburn, on December 25, Mr. John Major, aged 86 years.

Died, at his residence, Ballyclare, Mr. Edward Hill, on Nov. 27, aged 80 years.

Died, at Bresagh, Boardmills, near Lisburn, suddenly, on Dec. 4, Mr. Robert Wright, in the 74th year of his age. Mr. Wright was a striking example of the exercise of private judgment and the influence of free inquiry in overcoming early prejudices and preconceived religious impressions. He had been educated in the principles of Calvinism, as held in their most rigid form by the Seceders; but by a careful and patient study of the Sacred Volume, he arrived at the conclusion that the Father is the only true God, and that Jesus Christ is his only-begotten Son, and that the religious views in which he had been brought up could not be reconciled with the teachings of Christ and his apostles. After much and anxious thought, he yielded to the dictates of conscience, and openly avowed the principles of Christian Unitarianism, of which, till his death, he was a most earnest and able supporter. From his extensive knowledge of Scripture, and his zealous efforts to promote his views, he became well known to many ministers of the denomination, by whom he was highly esteemed. In discussion, he always supported his arguments by an appeal to the Scriptures, with which he was remarkably familiar, so that few of other Churches were willing to enter into controversy with him on religious subjects. Mr. Wright adorned his Christian profession by an irreproachable and exemplary life. We understand that he has left several tracts in manuscript, which possess much merit, and might advantageously be printed for circulation.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

The letter from "A Member of Committee," Ballyclare, is held over, as several of the matters referred to in it have been already noticed. If it should seem desirable to notice the other circumstances detailed, we shall do so in our next number.

An English Unitarian minister writes to inform us that the Rev. John Hall denies the accuracy of the statement in our July number, to the effect that on a certain Sunday he placed a young girl on a table in front of the pulpit, and set her to blow soap bubbles, that he might thus illustrate certain properties of the atmosphere. Whatever appeared in our magazine respecting Mr. Hall's extraordinary sayings and doings was on the authority of most respectable parties in Ballyclare; but we shall willingly publish any explanation or contradiction which Mr. Hall may see right to send us.

Orders for the work and business communications to be sent to the Agent of the Unitarian Society, 45, Arthur Street.

GTU Library



3 2400 00269 2808

